

The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

A CATHOLIC QUARTERLY
for Teachers and Students of History

Vol. XX

March • 1942

No. 3

Washington and the Catholics

Gilbert J. Garraghan

Herodotus - - Historian Humorist

Raymond V. Schoder

Reformation Historiography

Peter M. Dunne

More Contrasts:

Medieval and Modern

Robert J. Imbs

Editorials

Historians Part

History and
Historiography

Book Reviews

Secret History

The United States
and Civilization
Twenty Others

25c a Copy

\$1.00 a Year

THE MODERN SCHOOLMAN

A Quarterly for Scholastic Philosophy

March, 1942

| | |
|--|------------------------|
| "The Error of Aristotle"..... | John F. McCormick |
| Metaphysics of Predication..... | Robert A. Killoren |
| World Peace and Benedict XV..... | Patrick J. Holloran |
| Matter as a Principle of Being..... | William A. Van Roo |
| Symbolic Logic..... | Bernard J. Muller-Thym |
| Editorial..... | Book Reviews |

With the May issue there begins the first of a series of articles on
KANTIANISM AND THE MODERN WORLD

Published at

ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY, St. Louis, Mo.

\$1.00 yearly

Single copies 35 cents

INTRODUCING THE NEW OUTLINE HISTORY SERIES

Ancient and Mediaeval History

by F. J. Aspenleiter, S.J., M.A.

Published by—

THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN

St. Louis, Missouri

— Price Twenty cents

Attention, Librarians!

Are your files of *THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN* complete?

If not, let us supply you with the missing numbers.

Place your order NOW! The supply is limited.

N. B.—A complete index covering the last five years of *THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN* will be published in the May 1942 issue.

ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY

ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

Includes the following Schools and Colleges and Affiliated Institutions

CONSTITUENT SCHOOLS

| | |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| College of Arts and Sciences..... | 221 North Grand Blvd. |
| College of Arts and Sciences at Florissant..... | Florissant, Mo. |
| Graduate School..... | 15 North Grand Blvd. |
| University College..... | 15 North Grand Blvd. |
| School of Divinity..... | St. Mary's College, St. Marys, Kansas |
| School of Medicine..... | 1402 S. Grand Blvd. |
| School of Law..... | 3642 Lindell Blvd. |
| School of Philosophy and Science..... | 3633 West Pine |
| School of Dentistry..... | 3556 Caroline Street |
| School of Commerce and Finance..... | 3674 Lindell Blvd. |
| School of Nursing..... | 1325 S. Grand Blvd. |
| School of Social Work..... | 207 North Grand Blvd. |

THE CORPORATE COLLEGES

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Fontbonne College..... | Wydown and Big Bend Bldvs. |
| Maryville College..... | Meramec and Nebraska Avenues |
| Webster College..... | Lockwood Blvd., Webster Groves, Missouri |
| Notre Dame Junior College..... | Ripa Avenue, South Saint Louis |
| Saint Mary's Junior College..... | O'Fallon, Missouri |

THE HOSPITALS

1. UNIVERSITY HOSPITALS

- (a) St. Mary's Hospital..... Clayton and Bellevue Avenues
- (b) Firmin Desloge Hospital..... 1325 South Grand Blvd.
- (c) Mt. St. Rose Sanatorium..... 9101 South Broadway

2. AFFILIATED HOSPITALS

- (a) Alexian Brothers' Hospital..... 3933 South Broadway
- (b) St. Anthony's Hospital..... Grand Blvd. and Chippewa
- (c) St. John's Hospital..... 307 South Euclid Avenue

3. STAFF-RELATED HOSPITALS

- (a) St. Mary's Infirmary..... 1536 Papin Street
- (b) St. Louis City Hospital, Unit L..... 1515 Lafayette Ave.
- (c) Homer G. Phillips Hospital..... 2601 Whittier
- (d) St. Louis City Sanitarium..... 5300 Arsenal Street
- (e) St. Louis Isolation Hospital..... 5600 Arsenal Street

AFFILIATED NURSING SCHOOLS

- (a) Alexian Brothers' Hospital School of Nursing—
3933 South Broadway
- (b) St. John's Hospital School of Nursing..... 307 S. Euclid Ave.

THE OUT-PATIENT SERVICES

- 1. THE UNIVERSITY OUT-PATIENT DEPARTMENT
Firmin Desloge Hospital..... 1315 South Grand Boulevard

2. THE ASSOCIATED OUT-PATIENT DEPARTMENTS

- (a) Alexian Brothers' Dispensary..... 3933 South Broadway
- (b) St. John's Dispensary..... 4945 Audubon Avenue

THE STAFF-RELATED OUT-PATIENT DEPARTMENTS

- (a) City Dispensary..... 1515 Lafayette Avenue
- (b) The Obstetric Dispensaries
St. Louis Obstetrical Hospital Association
St. Ann's Foundling Asylum
- (c) The Pre-Natal Clinics
The Cass Avenue Clinic
The Bethesda Dispensary

WHITE HOUSE

St. Louis House of Retreats—

White House, Jefferson Barracks P. O., Missouri

The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

A CATHOLIC QUARTERLY

for Teachers and Students of History

Published quarterly in November, January, March and May by the Missouri Province Educational Institute, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo. Price: 25c a copy; \$1.00 a year. Entered as second-class matter January 7, 1932, at the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on January 20, 1933.

VOL. XX

MARCH, 1942

No. 3

Table of Contents

| | | |
|--|--------------------------------|----|
| GEORGE WASHINGTON AND THE CATHOLICS | GILBERT J. GARRAGHAN | 51 |
| HERODOTUS: HISTORIAN AND HUMORIST | RAYMOND V. SCHODER | 53 |
| EDITORIALS | | 55 |
| THE REFORMATION AND HISTORIOGRAPHY | PETER M. DUNNE | 57 |
| MORE CONTRASTS: MEDIEVAL VERSUS MODERN | ROBERT J. IMBS | 59 |
| BOOK REVIEWS | | 68 |

George Washington and the Catholics

Gilbert J. Garraghan, S. J., Ph. D.

Loyola University, Chicago

THE bicentennial of Washington's birth in 1932 was made the occasion of an elaborate country-wide commemoration under government auspices, the direction of it being in the hands of a national commission headed by the Harvard professor emeritus of history, Albert Bushnell Hart. Effort was especially made to engage the interest of the schools in the affair as an occasion for inculcating in the youth of the country patriotic sentiment and other ideals making for genuine and high-minded citizenship.¹

Fortunately the American people have no excuses or apologies to offer when they present George Washington to the world as an object of universal veneration and respect. His life, public and private, has been subjected, especially in recent years, to the most searching scrutiny and it has stood the ordeal remarkably well. Popular canonization of him began in his own day, and he has become for the citizens of the country he did more than anyone else to create their most distinguished exponent of civic integrity and virtue. What Washington had come to mean to the people of the United States while yet a living figure among them may be gathered from the remarkable eulogy pronounced on him at the time of his decease by Bishop Carroll of Baltimore.²

This paper proposes to deal with the relations Wash-

ington had with the Catholic Church. Though these were not by any means numerous, they were in one or other instance at least significant enough to reveal in definite ways his attitude towards that religious denomination.

The "Rules of Civility"

While Washington's acquaintance with Catholicism was apparently of the most superficial kind, it is a remarkable circumstance that an influence of Catholic and even Jesuit origin had probably more to do with his early training and the shaping of his character than any other known factor. Probably the trait in his character that most impressed people who dealt with him was his gentlemanliness. Newman's definition of a gentleman is "one who never knowingly inflicts pain." This definition, when one looks into it, implies proper deportment, good manners, for it is precisely failure to observe these things that often gives offence. One must, in fine, have a due regard for the conventionalities of social intercourse, for all the little observances that come under the general rubric of etiquette and politeness. A famous English school has for its motto the words of Wynken de Worde, "Manners Maketh the Man." Washington was one of the best mannered men of history and the extraordinary impression he made on contemporaries is to be explained in no small measure on this ground. But correct, gentlemanly deportment is much more than a matter of mere external etiquette; it means at bottom considerateness for others. It was largely because he was so considerate for others that Washington impressed himself deeply on friends and acquaintances as a gentleman of the first rank. It was a trait deeply rooted in his nature; it asserted itself in the very face of death.

¹ Washington was born near Fredericksburg, Westmoreland County, Virginia, February 11, 1731, Old Style, February 22, 1732, New Style.

² *Eulogy on George Washington Delivered in St. Peter's Church, Baltimore, February 22, 1800, by John Carroll, First Bishop and Archbishop of Baltimore, with a Foreword by Peter Guilday, Ph.D.* (New York, 1931). The Eulogy was first published in Baltimore in 1800 under the title, *A Discourse on General Washington Delivered in the Catholic Church of St. Peter, in Baltimore—Feb. 22, 1800—by the Right Rev. Bishop Carroll.*

As he lay expiring at Mount Vernon, his anxiety was great that he cause no unnecessary inconvenience to those who were serving his needs.

It is interesting to ascertain, if it be possible to do so, where Washington got his good manners. Woodrow Wilson thought he learned them from that elegant gentleman of the old school, Thomas Lord Fairfax, Washington's neighbor and boyhood friend. But Paul Van Dyke has raised the question whether Washington was really as close to Fairfax as has been supposed. Albert Bushnell Hart was of opinion that Washington's social graces came from association with his own relatives, who were all well-bred. Calvin Coolidge ventured the explanation that they were impressed upon him by the Huguenot minister, James Mayre, who is said to have been Washington's teacher.³ One thing we do know, that the future president before he was sixteen wrote out carefully in a copy book the famous "Rules of Civility and Decent Behaviour in Company and Conversation." Here we come to what in the opinion of many recent biographers was the influence which as much as anything else, if not more so, made Washington the gentleman he was. Of these rules a document issued by the Washington Bicentennial Commission declares that "no doubt they were an influence in moulding his remarkable character." Together with the training received from his mother, which was paramount, these rules were, according to the same source, "in a considerable degree responsible for his well-known courtesy and grace of deportment."

A most intriguing circumstance about these rules is that they are derived from a manual of politeness drawn up in a Jesuit school in seventeenth-century France. This origin for them seems to have been first pointed out by the agnostic writer, Moncure Daniel Conway, in his above-cited edition of the Rules of Civility.⁴ A further critical edition of the same rules was brought out in 1926 by Charles Moore, sometime-chief of the Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, who follows Conway in ascribing them to a Jesuit source.⁵ First com-

posed in French about 1595, they were sent by the boarders (*pensionnaires*) of the Jesuit college of La Flèche (where Descartes studied) to the boarders of another Jesuit college, that of Pont-à-Mousson. Here they were rendered into Latin by an outstanding Jesuit of his day, Père Leonard Périn, who added some rules of his own on etiquette at table. The first printed edition of the rules appeared at Pont-à-Mousson in 1617. Editions in other languages, including English, followed. The English version, based on the French text, was the work of Francis Hawkins (1628-1681), who was only eight when he performed the task. Hawkins later became a Jesuit. That he was of so tender an age when he "Englished" the rules in question is surely an astonishing thing, but it is set down soberly as a fact in the sketch of Hawkins in the British *Dictionary of National Biography*, which cites in evidence unequivocal data from the earlier editions of his translation.⁶ As written out by Washington in his exercise or copy book, the Rules of Civility number one hundred and ten, while the version in which they appear there is a literary improvement in some respects over that of Hawkins.

Just how the hundred and ten rules of civility came into the hands of young Washington and whether they were adapted from the Hawkins text by himself or some one else are open questions. Conway ventured the opinion that they were taken down in writing from dictation by his alleged teacher, the Reverend Mr. Mayre. Fitzpatrick suggests that a copy of them may have been given to him by his older brother, Lawrence. At all events, of their derivation from the English version of the Jesuit manual of politeness there can be no doubt, while of their formative influence on the character of Washington there appears to be virtual unanimity of opinion among the biographers. Says happily, one of the recent of them, Michael De la Bedoyere: "These rules happened to be a tiny corner of the far-flung net spread by the fathers of the Society of Jesus and never did that net make a more curious catch."⁷

The early biographers of Washington, one or other excepted, had nothing to say about the Rules of Civility or the influence they had in shaping his character. Conway, in the introduction to his edition of the rules, suggests that the silence of the first biographers about them

³ According to Charles H. Moore, whose book on the Rules of Civility is cited below, "He [Mayre] may have been Washington's teacher; but there is no proof that he taught in Fredericksburg or elsewhere or even that there was a school in Fredericksburg, in his time little more than a name. Indeed we are by no means certain that George Washington went to school" (p. xi). That James Mayre was "an ex-Jesuit French scholar" is asserted in Daniel Moncure Conway, *The Rules of Civility Traced to their Source and Restored* (London, 1890), 39. No evidence is alleged for the assertion except the few data found in Robert Alonso Brock (ed.), *Documents Chiefly Unpublished Relating to the Huguenot Emigration to Virginia* (Virginia Society Historical Collections, new series, v. 5, 1886), 183 et seq. While this source says merely that Mayre, a native of Rouen, in France, "was educated for and entered the priesthood," Conway conjectures that he was educated "no doubt at the Jesuit college in Rouen where Father Périn's book on manners was printed in 1651" (p. 30). Though it is not unlikely that Mayre attended the Jesuit college in Rouen, there is no evidence that he was ever a member of the Society of Jesus. According to the account in Brock, he left the Catholic Church, was ordained in London by its Protestant bishop, and came to America in 1729.

⁴ Conway in his researches depended on a copy in the British Museum of Périn's translation of the rules, a copy in the same depositary of the Hawkins translation, and data in De Backer's bibliography of Jesuit authors. Cf. Carlos Sommervogel, S.J., *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus* (11 v., Brussels-Paris, 1890-1932, sub voce Périn).

⁵ *Rules of Civility and Decent Behaviour in Company and Conversation* (Boston, 1926). Moore has a comparative study of the Hawkins and Washington versions of the rules.

⁶ Joseph Gillow, *Bibliographical Dictionary of the English Catholics* (5 v., London, 1885-), III, 191; *Dictionary of National Biography* (21 v., London, 1908-09), IX, 210. The first edition of Hawkins's translation was printed about 1641. The edition of 1654 has an engraved portrait of the boy with the legend. "Francis Hawkins tirant à l'age d'huit ans." In the second edition, London, 1646, *Youth's Behaviour or Decency in Conversation amongst Men: Composed in French by grave persons for the use and benefit of their Youth, Now Newly turned into English by Francis Hawkins*, the publisher apologizes for the style "wrought by an uncouth and rough file of one in greene years."

Francis Hawkins was born in London, 1628, became a Jesuit, 1649, died in Liège, 1681. "An excellent man, a good preacher, most pious, a good Israelite and an admirable example of a Jesuit." Henry Foley, S.J., *The Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus* (7 v., London, 1883-), VII, 1433.

⁷ George Washington (Philadelphia, 1935), 50. De la Bedoyere (p. 51) thinks the version of The Rules of Civility found in Washington's exercise book is "strangely similar in style to the 'Common Rules' and 'Rules of Modesty' of the Jesuits themselves. Indeed, it might be called an adaptation of those rules to extra-cloistral virtue." The suggested similarity is more fanciful than real.

Herodotus: Historian and Humorist

Raymond V. Schoder, S. J., M. A.

St. Louis University

IT is reported that President Lincoln, on hearing an erudite historian praised in the words "No one has ever plunged more deeply into the stream of learning," replied, laconically, "No, nor come up drier!" The learned author in question was *not* Herodotus. No one has ever recorded human achievements more entertainingly than he. For the old Greek, the founder in Europe of history and of artistic prose,¹ was no glum chronicler of the past, embalming the fervid activity and seething flux of life in a dreary shroud of statistics or undiversified chronological summaries. Being a literary artist as well as a historian, he showed once and for all how history can be made to glow with life, be charged with warmth of personality and dramatic significance. With the intrepidity of a great pioneer, he accomplished the impossible, and wrote a long history which is never for a moment dull.

Herodotus achieved this new and elusive feat by the concerted force of many outstanding talents. His work shows him a man of great diligence in research, honest, impartial, and of a shrewd but kindly disposition.² His style is delightfully simple and unsophisticated, even, at times, naive. He is conspicuous for unity and vividness of presentation, the provision of rich and diversified background to the main theme, a fine sense of the tragic and the sublime, graceful skill in character-portrayal, and an unsurpassed gift for story telling.

In all this, he is only the first great figure of an illustrious line. But in the further eminent quality of gentle, ever-alert humor he is almost the last. At best, his rivals are few and very far behind. We must allow that here is one feature at least of his historical heritage which has not been notably improved upon by his professional descendants. One of his signal merits is to have shown in his own person that it is in fact possible for a man to be both historian and humorist — not only in the plane of informal daily life (we have come upon this type often), but even in professional publication of diligently gathered research.

Herodotus' humor, then, is a unique feature of his work, a source of special delight to his readers. As it pervades his entire book, an understanding of it is essential to an adequate comprehension of his work and his significance. As it is the distinctive feature of his work, that which sets him apart from (dare I say: above?) his fellow historians, to understand it is to understand Herodotus in his most characteristic trait. It is this which justifies the present study of a minor and secondary, however specifically Herodotean, aspect of the great writer's achievement.

Throughout this discussion of Herodotus' sense of

humor, let us be clear on this fundamental point: his humorous stories are not, as certain solemn professors would make us believe,³ unintentional, or sprung from the childish gullibility of an unscholarly mind. The absurdity of this view is almost self-evident. As Christopher Hollis has said, it is hard to imagine how even learned Dons can be so fatuous as to think that Herodotus did not see the point of his own jokes.⁴ That Herodotus was by nature quick to perceive the humor of a situation or event and purposely admitted droll stories into his soberly intended work because he appreciated their charm and literary effect, should be the main conviction arising from the evidence here presented. Herodotus was not simple-minded, but a humorist. We should thank him for it, and fulfil his expectation that we will have enough sense of humor ourselves not to take such passages in his work too seriously.

For clarity's sake, it will be best to gather Herodotus' comic passages into several groups, according as they illustrate the various facets of his humor. Six different classes may be distinguished.

Humorous Asides

First there are his witty side remarks. Herodotus is describing Persian customs, and how they celebrate their birthdays with a lavish banquet. He says:

They are wont to eat little staple food but much dessert, which they never take all at once but in successive servings. And it is for this reason, they say, that the Greeks go away from table hungry—to-wit, because there is nothing worth mention set before them after the meats. Whereas if there were (and some of us may blush at the tale too), they would never leave off eating.⁵

Note how readily and cheerfully Herodotus adopts this piece of Persian wit at the expense of his fellow Greeks. But in a later passage,⁶ he turns the tables against the Persians. Xerxes, he relates, when on his way to attack Athens, compelled the Greek cities through which he passed in the north, to provide a meal for his army as it marched through. Many had to borrow silver plate from other cities to meet the huge demand. Now when the greedy host arrived at Abdera, Megacreon made a witty remark which Herodotus is delighted to record. The man, he says, bade his fellow citizens thank the gods that at least Xerxes did not have the habit of eating breakfast; for to provide that also would have completely ruined the city.

Aristagoras of Miletus, when urging the king of Sparta to send an army across the seas to help the Greeks on the continent in their struggle against the Persians, argued all points cleverly, Herodotus says,⁷ until asked how far inland the expedition would have to go. Then he blundered and told the truth — it would be, he said,

¹ It is not the purpose of this paper to debate Herodotus' general merits, or to justify these titles of honor. With minor qualifications, they are admitted once more by all Herodotean scholars (see, for example, the Introduction to How and Wells' *A Commentary on Herodotus*, Oxford, 1928). The fashion of considering him a Greek Sir John Mandeville has passed away with the Victorians.

² So kindly, in fact, that he was misled by some untrustworthy informants, whom he deemed as honest and diligent as himself; whence nearly all his errors.

³ See, for example, Col. Wm. Mure's *The Literature of Greece* (London, 5 vols., 1880-1889), IV, p. 508.

⁴ "Herodotus," in the *London Tablet* for Nov. 23, 1940, pp. 414-415.

⁵ 1.133 (citations are by Book and Chapter). The translation, as throughout, is my own.

⁶ 7.120.

⁷ 5.50-51.

a three months' march. Whereat the king cried out: O friend from Miletus, be gone from Sparta before the setting of the sun. For you propose no acceptable plan, in wishing to lead us three months' journey from the sea.

So Aristagoras had to go home, his mission a failure. Never again, Herodotus waggishly remarks, did he discuss the road which leads to the Persian king.

Surely it is obvious that Herodotus has his tongue in his cheek when he tells how the great famine in Lydia during the reign of Atys was mother to the invention of all games known to the Greeks. So grievous was the hunger, he says,⁸ that the Lydians sought remedy in various diversions — thereby inventing dice, knucklebones, ball, and indeed all games except checkers. This remedy worked as follows: every second day they would play at these games so intently that they forgot their desire for food, while on the other days they ate and forgot about their games. Thus did they manage to survive the famine for 18 years!

When discussing the Nile Delta,⁹ Herodotus refutes the Ionians' account with characteristic humor. Now they say all the earth is divided into three parts, Europe, Asia, and Libya (i.e., Africa). Yet they also claim that the Nile separates Asia from Libya. Whereas I have ascertained, he says, that the Nile splits into several mouths at the Delta, so that the triangular portion in between lies neither in Asia nor Libya, but is a separate, fourth country. "And thereby I prove that the Ionians don't know how to count."

Into his account of Scythia, Herodotus interjects¹⁰ the tale of Anacharsis, who was sent by the Scythian king to gain knowledge about the Greeks. He returned to report that he found them all exclusively occupied in the pursuit of every form of knowledge — except the Spartans, who however were the only ones who knew how to carry on a good conversation. "But this tale," Herodotus adds, after indulging in the fun of telling it, "was only thought up by the Greeks for their own amusement."

Quaint Accounts

A second group of instances may be made up from the naive (or should we say: 'whimsical') reports which Herodotus passes on for the entertainment, if not instruction, of his audience. Such is the delightful legend of the poet Arion.¹¹ He set sail from Tarentum for Sicily. But the sailors plotted to throw him overboard and seize his money. However, they agreed to let him first play a strain on his harp before jumping in, for they were eager to hear the very best harpist in the world. But Arion, after playing a spirited piece called the Orthian, and leaping into the sea in his full gorgeous costume, was carried ashore by a dolphin, and to this day, at Taenarum you may see a bronze statue of him seated on a dolphin.¹²

Herodotus must surely have enjoyed the further re-

port¹³ that among the Pedasians, who dwell above Herodotus' home city Halicarnassus, whenever any great danger threatens, the priestess of Athena suddenly grows a copious beard. That little prodigy will compare with any in Ripley's 'Believe it or Not' column.

Again, can anyone suppose that the witty old Greek did not smile as he wrote down his account¹⁴ of the Egyptians' love for their domestic animals, and how if a cat dies they shave their eyebrows, but on the death of a dog, their head and whole body?

Still better stories follow. Herodotus reports:¹⁵

There are in Arabia two kinds of sheep which I marvel at . . . One sort have tails as much as a foot and a half wide. . . . The other have long tails, of no less than five feet in length, which, if allowed to drag along the ground would be bruised and injured. But now-of-days every shepherd in those parts is something of a carpenter, so he makes little wagons which he ties under the tails, one wagon to each sheep.¹⁶

"Fish Stories"

Yet further proof of Herodotus' sense of humor is his inability to forego telling a good story even though he admits it is not true. Such, among many, is the legend of the phoenix.¹⁷ Herodotus says he never saw one, except in pictures, but he was told by the Egyptians a story concerning it which he cannot bring himself to believe. For they say the bird comes once every five hundred years, when its father dies, all the way from Arabia. In order to carry its parent, the bird first fashions an egg-shaped ball of myrrh, testing it till it is just light enough for it to fly with. Thereupon it hollows it out, puts its father within, seals up the opening with more myrrh, and soars off with it — the same weight as before — to Egypt, where it buries it in the temple of the Sun. For this charming tale, worthy even of Walt Disney's genius, we can thank the fun-loving Father of History; most of his scrupulous descendants would, alas, have scorned recounting such palpable fables — and so have robbed us of a lovably human flight of fancy.¹⁸

We smile, too, when he tells us¹⁹ why the gold-seekers of India ride female camels. They are faster, you see, because they recall their new-born young at home, and so speed unflaggingly back to their barns. Marco Polo, incidentally, asserts the same fact. It may be true, but it is certainly amusing.

Baron Munchausen was not, as is commonly believed, the inventor of amazing tales of distant wonders. Centuries before him, Herodotus pioneered in the subtle art of telling 'whoppers.' The old Greek also anticipated the famous irrefragable argument for silencing Missouri-born sceptics. For while recounting the marvels of

¹³ 1.175; it is also vouched for by Aristotle, *Historia Animalium* 3.11.

¹⁴ 2.66.

¹⁵ 3.113.

¹⁶ This story is a fact, and Barbary sheep such as Herodotus here describes are still to be found, not only in Arabia but in Africa and N. Asia, and are actually protected in this ludicrous but efficient manner (see How and Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus*, I. p. 292).

¹⁷ 2.73.

¹⁸ This recalls the quaint legend, employed by Aristophanes in the *Birds* (lines 1137 and 1428), that cranes, on their long flights of migration to and from Libya, swallowed big stones to serve as ballast against the buffeting of the winds!

¹⁹ 3.102 and 105.

(Please turn to page sixty-six)

⁸ 1.94.

⁹ 2.16.

¹⁰ 4.77.

¹¹ 1.23-24.

¹² As Rawlinson says, the legend probably grew up to account for the statue at Taenarum, which, as late as the 3rd century after Christ, was seen there by the historian Aelian.

The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

A CATHOLIC QUARTERLY
for Teachers and Students of History

RAYMOND CORRIGAN, Editor

Staff

ROBERT J. IMBS MARTIN P. HAGAN
EUGENE H. KORTH ROBERT W. LAMBECK
JOHN J. CAMPBELL LEONARD P. PIOTROWSKI

Advisory Board

MARTIN J. HARNEY FRANCIS S. BETTEN
Boston College Marquette University
THOMAS F. MAHER W. PATRICK DONNELLY
Gonzaga University Spring Hill College
CHARLES H. METZGER PETER M. DUNNE
West Baden College University of San Francisco
GERALD G. WALSH
Fordham University

EARL J. KURTH, Business Manager

Address communications to The Historical Bulletin, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.

EDITORIALS

The Historian's Part

It is a common experience of historians to have their colleagues and friends look upon them as sages on human affairs and oracles of future human events. The historian has a hard enough time recording the past let alone in taking over God's work of foretelling the future. But maybe there is something in the expectation that the historian be something of a so-called sage on human affairs.

If there is any "liberalizing" effect from the study of history, it should be the broadening of one's understanding of the enigma of human nature and of the strange course of human affairs. Before the eyes of the real historian pass, in intimate review, ages of human passions, fears, struggles, and hopes. Generations of men, good and bad, "big" and mean, intelligent and stupid, have strutted their brief hour on the stage before him. If a mere lifetime of experience can make a sage of an old man, generations of experience should make the historian the sage of the sages. As the seventeenth century writer, Thomas Fuller, has said:

History maketh a man old, without either wrinkles or gray hairs; privileging him with the experience of age, without either the infirmities or inconveniences thereof.

Present Application

Numerous applications of the true historian's sagacity arise in the circumstances of everyday life, especially in times of stress. How often have we heard the wildest attacks delivered against our president! Granted he has his faults and the fallibility of every man, granted that it is the privilege of a citizen in a democracy to criticize [*intelligently!*] his government, yet what wild and unreasoned attacks are sometimes made.

The historian has a long memory, one which stretches back more than 150 years to the founding of our country. George Washington, whose true patriotism few today impugn (it was often violently assailed during his own lifetime), believed that a chief executive, once elected, should be left to his own discretion in directing the affairs of his country (constitutionally of course) without any "coercion" from public clamor. Thomas Jefferson, the "First Democrat," was the first "party realist" when he took a little botanical trip up the Hudson with George Clinton in the summer of 1791 (a predecessor of present-day practical "golfing" and "fishing" trips).

Many, even in the North, looked upon Jackson's attempt to put down the South Carolina nullification threat as unconstitutional. And Lincoln, the canonized saint of American democracy, was probably the most arbitrary Chief Executive we have ever had. As one distinguished American historian has put it:

... Lincoln wielded a greater power throughout the war than any other chief magistrate, not excepting Wilson; a wider authority than any English-speaking ruler between Cromwell and Lloyd George. *Contemporary accusations against him of tyranny and despotism are strange reading to those who know his character, but not to students of his administration.* If Lincoln was the ideal tyrant of whom Plato dreamed, he was none the less a dictator from the standpoint of American constitutional law and practice; and even the safety of the Republic cannot justify certain acts committed under his authority. ... there were many men of high standing and character who preferred to risk defeat at the hands of the enemy rather than submit to an arbitrary government by their own president.

As this same historian continues:

Simultaneously with the Emancipation Proclamation, the President issued an order which seemed to deny white citizens the liberty which he proposed to accord to negro slaves. He proclaimed that all persons resisting the draft, discouraging enlistment, or 'guilty of any disloyal practice affording aid and comfort to the rebels' *would be subject to martial law, tried by court-martial, and denied the writ of habeas corpus.* Under this proclamation, over thirteen thousand persons were arrested and confined by military authority ...

Undoubtedly the provocation was great, especially in the North, where opposition to the war was open, organized, and active in almost every state. One of the most delicate and difficult subjects with which ... Lincoln ... had to deal was the peace movement. ... It included doctrinaire pacifists and defeatists; but the great body was composed of sincere persons, who ... believed that only the obstinacy of Lincoln prevented peace.

Lincoln had no clear mandate of the people for carrying on war with the South. But his views, and his determination, were simple: the Union *must* be preserved; and, in spite of Horace Greeley's New York *Tribune* and its attacks, held to his conviction that secession must be stopped even by war. And Lincoln, true to his principles, proposed to reconstruct the South "with malice towards none; with charity for all" in

Owing to other work, it has proved necessary for the Reverend Raymond Corrigan to abandon active work as editor of THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN. In the interim the Acting Editor Pro Tem will be Richard L. Porter. We regret that our readers will lose the valued editorial comments of the usual editor.

spite of Congress and the Northern hot heads. Congress luckily had adjourned and, unless the President should call them into special session, would not meet for eight months. Instead Lincoln planned to stretch his already wide war powers and admit the South into the Union as prodigals for whom the fatted calf should be killed rather than for whom the rod of punishment should be prepared.

It is strange that all three of those great presidents of our democracy, Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln, suffered so much at the hands of certain sections of public opinion. During his last year in office Washington was assailed with a virulence and opprobrium which few of his successors have suffered. The Philadelphia *Aurora*, on the morrow of Washington's retirement, proclaimed that

This day ought to be a Jubilee in the United States . . . for the man who is the source of all the misfortunes of our country, is this day reduced to a level with his fellow citizens.

Jefferson was deserted by his old-time party and left office in a wave of unpopularity. While Lincoln's untimely death saved him from the virulence which would have been heaped upon him as he attempted to carry through his plans for Reconstruction in the teeth of pent-up Northern rage.

Is the editorial page of the *HISTORICAL BULLETIN* debunking our American heroes? or worse yet, is it condoning executive irresponsibility, "dictatorship," "violations of the Bill of Rights," and warmongering? No, we are merely pointing out certain facts of history for consideration.

A long memory is not wisdom, but it may be the beginning of wisdom. "Reason" is too often influenced more by passion than true objectivity of evidence; perhaps a long memory will make us pause before we pass snap judgments. We must put first things first; collate reasons pro and con; and judge only when we know at least a *little* about the issues involved and the circumstances complicating the decision. And we must remember especially that those public men with whose action we do not agree are — at least not *ALWAYS* — motivated by base ambition, graft, irreligion, etc.

History and Historiography

A book, which will certainly find its way into the library of practically every university, has just been issued from the Chicago University Press.* Whatever may be considered its inadequacies, this book begins to fill a gap which has long been felt, the absence of a large and adequate literature in English on general European historiography.

The usual axiom for the writing of good history is "to go to the sources." But — I appeal to most of my readers to recall their own experiences in seminars — how many of their fellow students were able to examine these sources with sufficient skill and care to dispute really with the acknowledged scholars? As an excellent exercise in historical education, these seminars played a necessary role; also through experiences here many of the seminar students were able to learn the

technique of true historical research, test the interpretations of the great scholars, and certainly to understand better the particular ages in which they "majored."

To "go to the sources" is the best epistemological technique in history. True and certain knowledge can only be obtained through the evidence in the case, and the "sources" are the historian's evidence.

But the difficulty is always present to both the student historian and to the "finished product." Not every one has the talent or the will to dig back into the origins of historical knowledge, and, I believe this can be safely said, *that no single man can ever base all the history which he must know in order to teach an ordinary high school or college course upon his personal examination and evaluation of all the sources concerned.* As a matter of fact, secondary sources are the mainstay of each historian's knowledge — "secondary works" are the individual historian's main tools.

Every good workman must know his tools in order to be able to use them properly and skillfully. Historiography is the science of these secondary works. To be a good workman, the historian must have a knowledge of his author's competency, biases, and special theories. This knowledge, moreover, must be critical, based on some kind of trustworthy appreciation. In spite of what some people seem to think, historiography is not just a parlor pastime for historians, but is a really component part of the methods of historical study and research.

There are in English very few works which are sufficiently authoritative and comprehensive. Many exist in French and especially in German, but, unfortunately, few of them have been translated. It is a handicap which every graduate teacher of "methods" faces. Few of his students know their German with such fluency that they will attack Fueter or Schnabel save under the direst compulsion. Perhaps it will be said that all *serious* students who really contemplate research will gain that sufficient fluency and will read their Fueter with the same fervor, fluency, and frequency with which they read their Wodehouse. Supposing this view to be correct (!), it still remains that the great mass of teachers-to-be will not have had this required "seriousness" and they are the ones who need most the ability to use secondary works intelligently. It is to be hoped that either translations of the great foreign language works in historiography will be made, or, better still, that English-writing scholars will contribute notable works of their own.

This new work, which prompted all the above comments, is merely a collection of historiographical essays by former graduate students of the University of Chicago. The historians treated are Altamira, Ashley, Aulard, Croce, Delbrueck, Firth, Halévy, Hanotaux, Klyuchevsky, Lamprecht, Lavis, Lodge, Mareks, Mathiez, Milyukov, Pokrovsky, Rose, Ruffini, von Schmoller, Séé, Seignobos, and Temperley. All present much useful biographical and historiographical material, but the general impression is that a much more definitive work is needed. Collections of historiographical essays may be a beginning, but they can never be the perfection of work on historiography. The student who has the ambition, however, will find many leads in the extensive footnotes.

* *Some Historians of Modern Europe, Essays in Historiography by Former Students of The University of Chicago*, edited by Bernadotte E. Schmitt. Chicago. The University of Chicago Press. 1942. pp. x + 534. \$5.00

The Reformation and Historiography

Peter M. Dunne, S. J., Ph. D.

University of San Francisco

EDITOR'S NOTE:—*This is the third of a series of articles by Father Dunne. In the first two articles of this series he has shown the evidence of Catholic Culpability for the Reformation as interpreted by leading Catholic authorities as well as from the sources. In this short article — it is really nothing more than a personal plea — he asks historians, Protestant and Catholic, to approach the study of the Reformation in the search of Truth, not with a mind "prejudged" in bias and seeking only to damn the other side in a spirit of partisanship.*

SO strong were the passions aroused by the Protestant Revolt that even in this "enlightened" age the exhalations of old-time hatreds are still about. The minds of history teachers and history writers are still dizzied by the fumes of an ancient fury, their emotions are still stirred by an age-old quarrel, and their pens are still dipped in something less than uncontaminated truth. It is small wonder then that Luther's peerless biographer, Reverend Hartmann Grisar, deprecated the method of approach of both Protestant and Catholic to the period of the Reformation; that Father Antonio Astrain, illustrious historian of the Spanish Jesuits, made a comparison with Apelles, the ancient profile painter, who, of course, with his one-eyed friend, painted the profile from the side of the good eye. So Catholics, averred Astrain, painted conditions of the Church from the side of the good eye; Protestants from the side of the bad eye. The Jesuit thought that historians of all people should look things square in the face, for the upshot of such partisanship was that *nobody* understood the Protestant revolution.

Catholic writers, it must be admitted, were under strong provocation. Luther led the way, for whenever he thought of the papacy he all but collapsed in a purple apoplexy of rage. "The most hellish father, the Pope" was one of his mildest. The Centuriators of Magdeburg followed suit, prostituting history to party propaganda. To them St. Gregory VII was the "most monstrous of all monsters," seducer of women, murderer of other popes, before he mounted the "chair of pestilence." Six thousand children's heads were found in a nunnery fish-pond during the reign of Gregory I. For epithets some pages of the "Centuries" are marvelous to behold. Alexander III becomes here a "foul paunch, putrid belly, nasty pelt and stench bag," and when Pius IV is called a "devil's head," a "snotty rat's king" who fattened "like a sow in her sty," one becomes amazed at the ferocious manners and passions of the times.

The fury passed over into England and found its way into Fox's Book of Martyrs. In it we find the Bishop of London under Queen Mary, "Bloody Bonner," referred to as a "brockish boar of Babylon, a swill-ball, a blockhead, a belly-god." Upon such vitriolic hatred Englishmen had fed for centuries. The English Protestant Copley described the Jesuit, Robert Parsons, as "a common ale-house squire and the drunkenest sponge in all the parish where he lived." This time (it was not

the only time) the worm turned and Parsons described his antagonist Watson as "being so wrong-shapen and of so bad and blinking aspect that he looketh nine ways at once." The man was probably cross-eyed.

Furiously too these winds raced over the heathered hills of Scotland. Here John Knox blew brimstone from the wrath of his nostrils, referring to the Catholic Bishops of the south as "wily Winchester, dreaming Durham and bloody Bonner, with the rest of their bloody, butcherly brood" who "assuage their furious fumes" carried on by the "devil their sire."

Thus was the most gigantic of all legends begotten; thus did a campaign of hatred create the greatest unit of propaganda in all of history. We see it two centuries later in a history of the popes published in 1757 where the writer, professing impartiality and fairness, says: "Avarice, ambition, sacrilege, perjury, absolute contempt of everything sacred, the most amazing dissoluteness, every species of debauchery in excess, a total depravity and corruption of doctrine and morals characterize the history of the papacy." The epithets here are giveaways, — how could one use so many superlatives and still be correct! But the virus has seeped down four centuries to the present day. In a contemporary history of the Reformation by an American college professor we read that "scandal and opprobrium followed the [Jesuit] missionaries to the Occident as it had followed them to the Orient." Again, "In the end Cesare [Borgia] died of wounds, Alexander [VI] died by poison, and his daughter Lucrezia poisoned her own son and then herself;" all these are one-hundred-per-cent erroneous statements made by a present-day writer referring to the Borgia family.

Thus the legend has carried down the centuries. Here is the age of the Reformation from the side of the bad eye badly exaggerated; here is the provocation and temptation of Catholic writers of history. They succumbed too, not quite so badly; they painted from the side of the good eye only, and went on to make it even more comely than it actually was! One tried to paint the Church white, or almost white, the other tried to make it black. It has just been said, for instance, concerning Queen Mary Tudor that "she has been portrayed by the Protestants as a monster, by the Catholics as a saint. This has gone on too long. Let us have neither charcoal nor whitewash. Neither Luther, nor the Catholic ages, nor the early Protestants were white or black; they were a shade of grey. It is the historian's duty to discover, so far as possible, the exact shade of grey of every age and institution and personality. It will be quite impossible for him to come near the mark if he allow entrance into his psychology of even a part of the fumes of the ancient fury.

Things have indeed quieted down. The past-century school of Britain, which was first, foremost and always, English and Protestant, has been gradually changing to something less insular. From the Milmans, Freemans and Froudes we have come to the two Maitlands,

a Gairdner, and a Pollard. Even the last with his faults is a vast improvement upon a Gibbon. "The New History" has crossed the waters, and hosts of names could be mentioned which have outgrown fully, or almost fully, the old prejudice and the "old ignorance." And it is interesting that certain individuals, rising to a purer atmosphere as they advanced to historical maturity, have swung out of the old history into the new. The late Ephraim Emerton comes to mind and Paul van Dyke, as anyone who wishes to compare their earlier spirit with that of their later works can see.

One supposes that it is difficult for human nature to acquire a spirit of serene scientific detachment. But the ideals of the historian are clear, his duty is plain: he must acquire this detachment. The layman depends upon him for his knowledge of the past. The historian does an unethical thing, he deceives, if through emotion and the partisan spirit he paints the past different from what it was. When he holds up a picture before his readers or pupils and says: here is the past, he must not exaggerate either the shadows or the sunlight. If he does he falsifies the picture. History is, after all, not a gathering of roses and violets, but a presentation of the truth. So the liberal-minded Leo XIII, upon opening the Vatican Library to the scholars of the world, warned thus: "Let the historian not dare to say anything that is not true, but let him not be afraid to say anything that is true." A former General of the Society of Jesus, Father Louis Martín, in an instruction for Jesuit historians, said that the "only foundation for edification is the truth."

Concerning the Reformation period one had better not allow oneself to grow wrathful over the persecutions of Catholics by Protestants, for the simple reason that there would have been no Protestants had there not been so many bad Catholics, from both the laity and the clergy. Then too, if one is going to go into the question of persecution, one had better be careful again. Catholic historians are old hands at this: mentioning or deprecating the persecution of Catholics by Protestants; saying nothing about the persecution of Protestants by Catholics. We have heard so much about the cruelty of Queen Elizabeth whilst little or nothing about the persecution of the Catholic Queen Mary. As a matter of fact, the latter's persecution of Protestants was more cruel than Elizabeth's. Death is the supreme penalty. Now under Mary in four years close to three hundred received capital punishment, whilst Elizabeth put to death no one in the first ten years of her reign, and, during the next thirty-five, not over two hundred. Mary condemned formally for religion; Elizabeth formally for treason. Even at that, Catholics would have fared far better had Pope Pius V not tried to dethrone England's Protestant Queen and had Catholics not plotted so frequently against her life with the approval and encouragement of the papacy. What could Catholics expect?

Again, it is deceiving to mention the hundreds slain by Elizabeth in one winter and say nothing of the fact that those slain had risen in revolt against the throne.

Statements of thousands slain (always Catholics of course in a Catholic history) can readily be unfair, de-

ceptive, or squarely untrue. One had better be very careful in going into numbers and of giving them only on the one side. There was a massacre of St. Bartholomew, a cold slaughter of Protestants by Catholics; there was the Spanish Duke of Alva's "Council of Blood" in the Low Countries; there was the expulsion of the Jews and Moors from Spain and the long continued working with capital punishment of the Spanish Inquisition. When one looks on both sides, one begins to think that, so far as physical persecution and the death penalty is concerned, it is about even up. On the Continent Catholics did far more killing. They were better organized here; had more power, and their excuse for persecuting was greater. But partisan history will, of course, always tack the larger numbers of those slain on to the other side!

It is sad to read of those times, perhaps the cruelest in the history of Europe up to the present century, when Christianity seemed to lead men to hate and mutual slaughter rather than to love. It is sad to see how England lost the faith, to read of the tyranny of Henry VIII, the dissolution of the monasteries, and the suffering of so many excellent men and women. Yet, a strong, spiritual, energetic papacy assuming just a little vigorous leadership could have prevented the catastrophe; even a strong, united group of English bishops could have prevented it. But the papacy, represented by the Medici Clement VII, was unbelievably weak; it exerted no leadership of the kind required to save the situation. Yet, an older Catholic traditional history made of this pope a hero, whereas an awful weight of responsibility for the loss of England rests upon the debility, the vacillation, the corruption of his policies.

The many-sided complexities of history should give pause to all historians. If the liberal-minded Leo XIII advanced the cause of the Church and its prestige, and we frankly say this with enthusiasm or approval, then must we aver with equal candor that the illiberal Pius IX in certain ways harmed the church in Europe and in both the Americas through lack of the qualities Leo possessed. Should we be afraid to call a pope illiberal? After all we are writing history! If Pius IX and some of his predecessors were ultra-conservative and reactionary, let the Catholic historian say so; if they forbade vaccination and disallowed gas lighting because it came out of revolutionary France, let the historian comment on such policies (when comment is called for) with the disapproval they deserve.

Partisanship has been the ruination of the history of the Reformation for a very long time. Catholic writers have not escaped, whether because of timidity, rancor, a misapplied reverence and respect, or from the mere vulgar partiality of being for one's own side. Both sides have been provoked by such an attitude. It does harm. It retards the advancement of truth, of science, of mutual understanding, and of the cooperation of all good men. A sane and robust intellectualism utterly rejects it. Candor is as refreshing as it is honorable and pleasing to God; fairmindedness and justice is what Christ taught, it is what we all demand. The historian has a special calling to advance the truth, and this truth, which is divine, cannot but carry blessings.

More Contrasts: Medieval versus Modern

Robert J. Imbs, S. J.

St. Louis University

Nicholas Berdyaev, surveying the unhappy condition of European civilization at the close of the first World War, summed up the situation in the terse comment: "We are witnessing the end of the Renaissance." In his opinion the struggle of warring ideals that threatens the western world from within, is the direct spiritual heritage of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, which, in drawing European society away from the medieval loyalties, set it on a path, whose end is a "new, 'civilized' barbarism".¹ This is indeed a sharp contrast to the attitude of those historians who hold that the glory of the Renaissance is heightened when viewed in the light of its ultimate issue, — the modern world. To them the condition of mankind today is unquestionably superior to the period of "medieval night" from which it was "rescued."

There are, then, these two schools of thought on the value of the Renaissance. Both agree that this was

the great period of transformation by which the ideals that dominated the Middle Ages gave place to those at large in Europe today. But in the advantage or disadvantage of the change lies the quarrel. What is it precisely that man has gained and has lost by abandoning the medieval culture?

In the following quotations taken from the works of prominent modern authors, there is found a strong case for those who question the value of our modern substitute for the ideals of medieval Europe. It is obvious that here the entire argument cannot be given in full, yet the excerpts though brief, should go some way toward explaining this point of view. One can best appreciate this attitude by grouping the judgments on the Middle Ages and the Modern World about the central points of a philosophy of life, followed by social, political, economic, and, finally, cultural ideals.

Philosophy of Life

MIDDLE AGES

"Medieval man has attempted to base his life on the supernatural. His ideal of knowledge was not the adventurous quest of the human mind exploring its own kingdom, it was the intuition of the external verities which is itself an emanation from the Divine intellect."²

"The Middle Ages had fashioned human nature according to a 'sacral' type of civilization, based on the conviction that earthly institutions with all their vigor and strength are at the service of God and divine things to realize His kingdom on earth. The Middle Ages doggedly strove to realize that kingdom on earth, dreaming, yet without any rigor of austerity and without preventing life from pursuing the normal course of its activity—of a hierarchically unified world, in which the Emperor on the summit of the temporal should maintain the body politic in Christendom in unity, as the Pope on the summit of the spiritual should maintain the Church in unity."³

"... Durham or Lincoln, Chartres or Rheims, stand pre-eminently for one thing—the union of all men's energies in the service of God. We find the same architectonic grandeur in the great *Summa* of St. Thomas ordering all man's knowledge under the wisdom of God, and in the intensely human *Divine Comedy* that seems to spring from the whole of human life, complete in its errors and in its aspirations. The Christian ideals were embodied in the visible institution, the Church, which undertook to administer authoritatively the moral life of the community. Since the Church was the sole ark of salvation and the supreme authority in all matters of faith and morals, conformity with its regulations was the framework within which men's varying aims were sought."⁴

¹ Nicholas Berdyaev, *The End of Our Time*, New York, Sheed & Ward, 1933, 59.

² C. Dawson, "Christianity and the New Age," *Essays in Order*, New York, MacMillan, 1931, 161.

³ Jacques Maritain, "Religion and Culture," *Essays in Order*, New York, MacMillan, 1931, 14.

⁴ J. H. Randall, *The Making of the Modern Mind*, Houghton & Mifflin, New York, 1940, 58.

⁵ C. Dawson, *The Modern Dilemma*, London, Sheed & Ward, 1932, 96.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 28.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 30.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 92.

⁹ N. Berdyaev, *The End of Our Time*, New York, Sheed & Ward, 1933, 55.

¹⁰ M. de la Bedoyère, *The Drift of Democracy*, London, Sheed & Ward, 1931, 68.

¹¹ C. Dawson, "Christianity and the New Age," *Essays in Order*, New York, MacMillan, 1931, 237.

¹² *Ibid.*, 205.

MODERN WORLD

"And so too, in Europe, the tendency seems all towards the development of a purely *secular* type of culture which subordinates the whole of life to practical and economic ends and leaves no room for any independent spiritual activity."⁵

"European culture has been undergoing a process of secularization and materialization which has not only destroyed its unity but ultimately threatens it with barbarism, since it means a return to the ethics of the tribe, and a reduction of democracy to mass dictatorship and of science to a kind of utilitarian magic."⁶

"The ordinary man has not consciously denied the Christian tradition; he has simply lost sight of it in his concentration on material progress . . . We have attempted to combine a material organization of the world more scientific and elaborate than any previous civilization has known, with a disregard of spiritual values and a denial of the need for spiritual order."⁷

"Moreover, behind this vague tendency to treat religion as a side issue in modern life, there exists a strong body of opinion that is actively hostile to Christianity and that regards the destruction of a positive religion as absolutely necessary to the advancement of modern culture."⁸

"Interiorly divided and drained of his spiritual strength, man becomes the slave of base and inhuman influences; his soul is darkened and alien spirits take possession of him."⁹

"Human nature has gradually descended from a religious outlook through an ethical and humanist stage, itself dependent upon religion, to a purely selfish level where the good is measured by the amount the individual can grasp."¹⁰

"The old economists had excluded human values from economic life but they had not attempted to deny them entirely. Outside business hours the economic man was free to behave as a human being. But to the Communist, no such dualism is possible. The economic life absorbs the whole man and the whole society. The political, intellectual and spiritual aspects of life are all subordinated to the economic end which alone is absolute and consequently is the only ethical criterion."¹¹

"It [the Western Mind] has made man the measure of all things and sought to emancipate human life from its dependence upon the supernatural. Instead of the whole intellectual and social order being subordinated to spiritual principles, every activity has declared its independence, and we see politics, economics, science and art organizing themselves as autonomous kingdoms which owe allegiance to no higher power."¹²

"There is a second moment when it is perceived that a culture which keeps itself dissociated from the supreme supernatural standards must necessarily take sides against them; it is then required to establish an order which shall be considered to be based on nature, and is expected to emancipate man and guarantee the spirit of riches, undisturbed possessions of the earth; that is the moment of rationalist optimism, the bourgeois moment

¹³ Jacques Maritain, "Religion and Culture," *Essays in Order*, New York, MacMillan, 1931, 20.

¹⁴ Pius XII, Encyclical "Darkness over the Earth," quoted in *The Pope Speaks*, Harcourt Brace, New York, 1940, 159.

of our culture. We are just about to emerge from it. A third moment is a moment of materialist pessimism, the revolutionary moment, when man irrevocably considering himself to be his own last end, and unable any longer to endure the machinery of this world, engages, as we see in Russia, at the present day, in a deliberate battle against natural law and its Author, and undertakes to produce out of a radical atheism an entirely new humanity."¹³

"Both in private life and in the state itself, and moreover in mutual relations of race with race, of country with country, the one universal standard of morality is set aside; by which we mean the natural law, now buried away under a mass of destructive criticism and neglect."¹⁴

Social Ideals

MIDDLE AGES

"The fundamental note in medieval civilization is the complete harmony between the individual and the social. Society is a great hierarchy of ascending orders in which every man has his God-appointed function and recognized obligations, and at the same time, his rights and privileges. Every man is a member of some estate or group, and each estate is an essential organ of the whole, discharging a function at once peculiar to itself and necessary to the full life of Christendom. . . . All men existed in and for each other, and are bound to each other by an intricate network of mutual obligations."¹⁵

"Christianity drawing upon the stoic teaching of the equality of man—though not the similarity of man—and the single society of all humanity, was both more democratic in spirit and more universal than Platonism."¹⁶

¹⁵ J. H. Randall, *The Making of the Modern Mind*, New York, Houghton & Mifflin, 1940, 58.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 60.

¹⁷ N. Berdyaev, *Christianity and Class War*, London, Sheed & Ward, 1933, 70.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 62.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 33.

²⁰ N. Berdyaev, *The End of Our Time*, New York, Sheed & Ward, 1933, 51.

²¹ C. Hayes, *A Political and Cultural History of Modern Europe*, II, New York, MacMillan, 1936, 303.

²² Pius XI, "Post War Troubles," quoted in *The Pope Speaks*, Harcourt Brace, New York, 1940, 298.

MODERN WORLD

"Class hatred is so widespread that one sometimes loses all hope of a peaceful settlement; it seems as if all negotiations have failed and that it is already too late."¹⁷

"Materialistic Communism and Capitalism are equally liable to condemnation at the bar of absolute values of Christianity, for they have a common principle. Marxian Socialism sets class above personality and regards man solely as a function of society, nor do the bourgeois and capitalist ideologies see him differently; we find the same domination by an impersonal 'collective' in both Capitalism and Communism."¹⁸

"The most striking and inhuman error of Marxism consists in refusing to see man above the classes, but to place classes above man, to reduce man in his highest manifestations and his deepest spiritual experiences to a subordinate function of the class which must condition both his contemplation and his creative work."¹⁹

"The 'Class' (in Socialism) takes the place of man; the value of his individual soul and destiny is denied, he is simply a means towards social collectivization and its development."²⁰

"In the circumstances the bourgeois capitalist spirit—the spirit ambitious for profits from banking, industry and trade—possessed in an unwonted degree, the bourgeois not alone but also the other traditional classes of European society. To emulate great captains of industry became more and more the eager desire of the whole citizenry of an industrialized nation with obviously revolutionary social effects."²¹

"In the first place must be put that class warfare which has penetrated among the nations like a deadly infection, poisoning work, the arts, commerce, everything in fact that tends to private and public well-being. And the evil is made worse by increasing lust for material goods on the one side, tenacity in holding them on the other, on both sides, desire for possession and power."²²

Political Ideals

MIDDLE AGES

"The nation was accepted as a social fact and men paid it a certain natural loyalty but they also accepted the existence of Europe or Christendom as the ultimate spiritual or cultural unity."²³

"Even before the common man acquired political rights, he possessed a real kind of spiritual citizenship as a member of the universal Christian society. This was the fundamental citizenship in comparison with which man's membership of the state was a secondary and relative matter. And consequently the state was not the absolute master of the destinies of an individual."²⁴

"The crowning achievement of the Middle Ages was that within the limits of the West it was able to raise the ideal of an united Christendom, and bring all mankind within the scope of its aim. For European civilization at the height of the Middle Ages constituted under the Church one great fairly homogeneous society with uniform and universal institutions and common aspirations."²⁵

"The law [in the Middle Ages] was above the law-giver. Thus all approach to the modern idea of sovereignty seemed barred; no idea of absolutism or an arbitrary irresponsible power vested in a sovereign human will could in theory exist."²⁶

"The note of all medieval thought is its universalism. It assumes the existence of a single, universal society, which on its lay side is the inheritance and continuation of the ancient Roman empire; and on its ecclesiastical side, the incarnation of Christ in a visible church. . . . When we speak of Church and State in any consideration of the Middle Ages, we must

MODERN WORLD

"It [totalitarianism] involves purposeful inculcation of 'statolatry'—veritable worship of the state—and drastic restrictions on other kinds of worship. Both Marxian Communism and totalitarian nationalism have religious features; they are endowed with symbols and rites; they stir popular emotions; they point individuals and societies to a 'good life.' But fundamentally both are rivals and adversaries of traditional and supernatural world religions."²⁸

"As nationalism in the post-war period assumed even more rampant and more intolerant forms . . . all over the world national interests real or fancied were constantly exaggerated and were pressed by people and pursued by statesmen . . ."²⁹

"It [nationalism] affected men's minds and hearts as the industrial revolution affected their bodies, only faster and more completely. If the Industrial revolution promised to draw peoples together in a common and essentially new material civilization, nationalism actually wrought a psychological and spiritual separation of peoples resembling primitive tribalism."³⁰

"The waning of individualistic democracy and parliamentary government, the contraction of personal liberty, the triumph of nationalism over internationalism, the failure of education to make people intelligent or critical and its extensive use to fortify dictatorship, all these were marks of a new age."³¹

"This novel religion of nationalism, this making of the nation an end in itself has had among other lamentable results the splitting up of our common cultural tradition, our general quality as Europeans, into a number of isolated fragments which do not lament this division as an accident to be remedied.

remember that we are not speaking of two societies, but rather of the two governments of a single society . . . Church and State were one society but the society had two governments. There might be and there were disputes, between the two governments, but the society was and remained undivided. It was a single *Respublica Christiana* in which churchmanship was coextensive with citizenship."²⁷

²³ C. Dawson, *The Modern Dilemma*, London, Sheed & Ward, 1932, 13.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 67.

²⁵ J. H. Randall, *The Making of the Modern Mind*, New York, Houghton & Mifflin, 1940, 102.

²⁶ H. O. Evannett, "Authority and Moral Order," in *Church and State*, London, Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1936, 194.

²⁷ Ernest Barker, "Medieval Political Thought," in *The Social and Political Ideas of Some Great Medieval Thinkers*, Harrup & Co., London, 1923, 12.

²⁸ C. H. Hayes, *A Political and Cultural History of Modern Europe*, II, New York, MacMillan, 1936, 1128.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 1009.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 1048.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 1094.

³² H. Belloc, *Survivals and New Arrivals*, London, Sheed & Ward, 1929, 144.

but glory in it as a thing to be increased by all means in their power."³²

"Civil liberty has not done what was asked of it, it has not even been achieved. Its concomitant so-called 'Democracy' has not done what was asked of it; it has not given man dignity or security. Both of these great ideals of the 19th century are ending in mere plutocracy."³³

"The great fault of modern democracy—a fault that is common to the capitalist and the socialist—is that it accepts economic wealth as the end of society and the standard of personal happiness. We have made increase of wealth the criterion of social improvement . . ."³⁴

"At the basis of these new [national] states there is self-affirmation of man, first in the monarchies, then in the democracies, and these humanist national states are doomed to deny themselves. Humanist democracy undermines religious foundations of the state and prepares the conditions for its fall into anarchy."³⁵

³³ *Ibid.*, 278.

³⁴ C. Dawson, *The Modern Dilemma*, London, Sheed & Ward, 1932, 61.

³⁵ N. Berdyaev, *The End of Our Time*, New York, Sheed & Ward, 1933, 53.

Economic Ideals

MIDDLE AGES

"The essence of the régime which prevailed in the Middle Ages was . . . 'at first chaos roughly organized; later on confusion perpetuated by custom.' But this did not alter the significance of the fundamental principles involved. It was recognized that property and its attendant authority should be, even if they were not, not an absolute possession or a sacred right but the conditions of the performance of service."³⁶

"In theory, medieval business was a cooperative enterprise for the good of all, controlled and regulated by moral principles toward a religious end. These theories canonist writers developed in great detail. Though here, as throughout, practice fell far short of profession . . . many facts in the economic situation aided the Christian attempt to curtail competition in the interests of brotherly community."³⁷

"The first great principle of business enterprise of the towns was that industry was under group control, and that interference on the part of the group was entirely justified. Property had no absolute right apart from the well-being of the group.

"The second great principle is that value is something objective. . . . Hence everything has its just price."³⁸

³⁶ J. H. Randall, *The Making of the Modern Mind*, New York, Houghton & Mifflin, 1940, 84.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 89.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 91.

³⁹ N. Berdyaev, *Christianity and Class War*, London, Sheed & Ward, 1933, 67.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 26.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 102.

⁴² M. de la Bedoyère, *The Drift of Democracy*, London, Sheed & Ward, 1931, 7.

⁴³ C. Dawson, *The Modern Dilemma*, London, Sheed & Ward, 1932, 38.

⁴⁴ Pius XII, "Easter Sermon, 1939," quoted in *The Pope Speaks*, New York, Harcourt Brace, 1940, 128.

⁴⁵ Pius XI, "Quadragesimo Anno," quoted in Lewis Watt, S. J., "Economics," *Church and State*, London, Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1936, 311.

MODERN WORLD

"The right of property is recognized and guaranteed but it is that of those in possession and not the right in or the property of the poor man and the worker. Society does not recognize the most real of all rights, the right to life, for, if so monstrous a phenomenon as unemployment can belong to wealthy societies it cannot be admitted that there is any recognized right to work . . . many are in fear for tomorrow, many are hungry and in want while others enjoy colossal fortunes. . . . In the economic world liberty is not determined formally but materially, by the means and methods of production."³⁹

"In political democracies men are very easily reduced to unemployment, need, and indigence; the individual's economic rights are not guaranteed to him and the possession of electoral rights is no help at all. Political and juridical equality go hand in hand with the greatest social and economic inequality."⁴⁰

"The bourgeois refuses to see his work in its aspect as a part of the service of mankind and has been the principal contributor to the 'atomization' of human society; he has established the principle and fact of economic competition with its pitiless selfishness and put all his money on the power of force. He has exalted the development of material economic resources above man and the soul of man."⁴¹

"Disillusionment has increased as rapidly as prosperity. A bitter disillusionment hitherto unknown has been experienced by those whom 'progress' has forgotten and who in a world of plenty are hardly better off than the poorest of their forefathers."⁴²

" . . . Our mechanical civilization is a danger because it lacks a soul. We created it to serve our immediate needs, above all else the needs of wealth. We never intended to sacrifice to it our personal liberty or our tradition of culture or spiritual ideals. But now it has grown so powerful that it threatens to absorb the whole of life and to make the individual man nothing but a cog in the economic machine."⁴³

"Who is there who cannot see how in such crises of unemployment as those our own time experiences, huge multitudes are created through this very lack of work, of men utterly wretched, whose unhappy condition is worsened by the bitter contrast it presents with the pleasure and luxurious living of others altogether unconcerned about those armies of the needy."⁴⁴

"There is the struggle for economic supremacy itself; then the fierce battle to acquire control of the state, so that its resources and authority may be abused in economic struggles; finally the clash between states themselves . . . because economic forces and economic domination are used to decide political controversies between nations."⁴⁵

Cultural Ideals

MIDDLE AGES

"Of all the epochs of effort after a new life, that of the age of Aquinas, Roger Bacon, St. Francis, St. Louis, Giotto, and Dante is the most truly spiritual, the most really constructive, and indeed the most truly philosophic. . . . The whole thir-

MODERN WORLD

"Above all and in the period since the war there has been a growing tendency toward the de-intellectualization and exteriorization of European life. The old fixed canons of social and moral conduct have been abandoned and society has given

teenth century is crowded with creative forces in philosophy, art, poetry and statesmanship . . ."⁴⁶

"The great intellectual triumph of the age was the formation of a system of philosophic thought known as scholasticism. . . . At the summit of this vast pyramid of learning appeared the doctrines taught by the divinely instituted church and revealed to her. Thus the entire realm of human learning whether sacred or profane, was brought together into one harmonious system."⁴⁷

"There was one common creed, one ritual, one worship, one sacred language, one Church, a single code of manners, a uniform scheme of society, a common system of education, an accepted type of beauty, a universal art, something like a recognized standard of the Good, the Beautiful and the True."⁴⁸

⁴⁶ Frederick Harrison quoted in J. J. Walsh, *The Thirteenth, Greatest of Centuries*, Jubilee Edition, XI.

⁴⁷ H. S. Lucas, *The Renaissance and the Reformation*, New York, Harpers, 1934, 130.

⁴⁸ Frederick Harrison quoted in J. J. Walsh, *The Thirteenth, Greatest of Centuries*, Jubilee Edition, XII.

⁴⁹ C. Dawson, "Christianity and the New Age," *Essays in Order*, New York, MacMillan, 1931, 169.

⁵⁰ C. Hayes, *A Political and Cultural History of Modern Europe*, II, New York, MacMillan, 1936, 1095.

⁵¹ H. Belloc, *Survivals and New Arrivals*, London, Sheed & Ward, 1939, 189.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 237.

⁵³ N. Berdyaev, *The End of Our Time*, New York, Sheed & Ward, 1933, 61.

itself up to the current of external change without any attempt towards self direction or preservation of spiritual continuity. But this acceptance of new conditions is in itself negative, and possesses no creative quality. It points to the dying down and stagnation of culture rather than its renewal . . . the dying away of that tradition [humanism] naturally involves the temporary cessation of cultural creativeness."⁴⁹

"People still liked literature and music and the pictorial and plastic arts. But in all these respects there were acutely chaotic differences of conviction and taste. . . . The world whose material civilization was being rapidly unified by a common industrialization, was simultaneously being rent assunder psychologically and culturally by a new tribalism."⁵⁰

"Upon dissecting we discover the 'Modern Mind' to contain three main ingredients and to combine them through the force of one principle. Its three ingredients are pride, ignorance and intellectual sloth; their unifying principle is blind acceptance of authority not based on reason. . . . As to the principle of blindly accepting an authority not based on reason, it runs through the whole base affair and binds it into one: Fashion, Print, Iteration, are commanders abjectly obeyed and trusted."⁵¹

"When it [the new Paganism] is mature, we shall have, not the present isolated, self-conscious insults to beauty and right living, but a positive co-ordination and affirmation of the repulsive and the vile."⁵²

"It looks as if beauty were breaking up and dying, as if free creativeness of man will henceforth be impossible, as if his free individuality had reached its terms."⁵³

George Washington and the Catholics

(Cont. from page fifty-two)

is probably to be explained by the circumstance that the latter, with their strong democratic sympathies, did not care to show Washington as interested in a manner of deportment which savored or seemed to savor more of the colonial aristocracy and gentry than of the common folk of the new-born American republic.⁸ Henry Cabot Lodge, who wrote one of the better Washington biographies, knew of the Rules of Civility, but did not attach importance to them as a moulding influence on his subject's character.⁹ But some of the more recent biographers see in them a capital influence in this direction. Not only did they teach him excellent manners; they became in virtue of this result an influence that reacted on American society and even beyond. "In the hand of that man of strong brain and powerful passions," wrote Moncure D. Conway, "once lay the destiny of the New World, in a sense, human destiny. But for his possession of the humility and self-discipline underlying his Rules of Civility, the ambitious politicians of the United States might today be popularly held to a much lesser standard." "The strong probabilities," also comments Conway, "that they largely moulded the character of Washington and so influenced the human race, may raise the question whether the old French Jesuits and the pilgrim, James Mayre, did not possess more surely than our contemporary educators the art and mystery of moral education."¹⁰ Says Charles Moore:

⁸ *Ibid.*, 8.

⁹ Lodge, however, writes: "These rules were in the main wise and sensible and it is evident they made a deep impression on the boy's mind. There is something strangely prophetic about these little aphorisms for all the serious rules are very characteristic of Washington throughout life. What, for example, could be more apt than the last one given by Mr. Sparks: 'Labor to keep alive in your breast that little spark of celestial fire called conscience'?" *George Washington* (American Statesman Series, 2 v., Boston, 1890), I, 50.

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, 45, 46.

The fact that young Washington wrote out those Rules before he was sixteen years old and that he practiced them all his life has caused them to be regarded as one of the most important parts of his education. Undoubtedly they were; they expressed in concrete form the ambition which he always displayed, namely, by diligence to stand before the best of the earth and not before mean men. Time has changed what is simply accidental in the Rules, but the essence of them is as potent today as it was when they were composed by the Jesuit priests of centuries ago. The boy of today who learns and practices them is fitted for any society anywhere.¹¹

And Owen Wister has written:

With these rules the boy's strong-built and passionate nature was deeply instilled before he stepped forth upon his adventurous journey in the world. The part they played in his life—since his public and private acts show their spirit and teaching at every turn—was of the first importance, not to him alone, but also to his country. And to this it should be added that from these rules and their moulding of Washington's character flowed his power of address—the consideration and simplicity—which won for him, as it won for no other of his time, the esteem and devotion of those who could help our Revolution in the direst hours of its need . . . Madison and Monroe were also taught their good manners and almost certainly by these same rules at the Fredericksburg school . . . Such were the precepts that Washington copies as a boy of fourteen and they entered as leaven into the young lump of strength. 'Your future character and reputation' (he writes forty-three years afterward to a nephew), 'will depend very much if not entirely upon the habits and manners which you contract in the present period of your life.' These words are not the facile commonplaces of an elderly man moralizing to a youth. They indicate that Washington was entirely aware of the great influence for good exerted upon his own character by the Rules of Civility. It is a misfortune for all American boys in all our schools today that they should be told the untrue story of the hatchet and cherry tree and denied the immense benefit of instruction from George Washington's authentic copy-book.¹²

¹¹ *The Family Life of George Washington* (Boston, 1926), 30.

¹² *The Seven Ages of Washington, A Biography* (New York, 1924), 28-30, 35. "His [Washington's] conduct in after life so closely paralleled many of these precepts that their influence should not be entirely ignored, though no definite claim can be made as to their extent." John C. Fitzpatrick, *George Washington Himself: A Common Sense Biography Written from his Manuscripts* (Indianapolis, 1933), 21.

Washington and Religious Bigotry

A great deal of discussion has turned on the question of Washington's religious creed. That he professed a high regard for religion, however he conceived it, as a necessary prop of the social order, is one of the best known facts about him. The words of the Farewell Address are familiar: "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. . . . And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion." But it is difficult to conclude from the known tenor of his life that religion for him was a particularly personal or intimate affair. De la Bedoyere concludes that the religion of the first president did not go beyond a "hallowed morality."¹³ In all his voluminous correspondence the name of the second person of the Trinity occurs but twice. But he was a pew-holder in the Protestant Episcopal Church at Alexandria and attended services there with regularity, though he is said not to have knelt in church nor in his latter years taken part in the communion rite.¹⁴ Strangely enough, he summoned no clergyman to his bedside when dying, on which occasion, as far as can be gathered from the circumstantial account of his last moments left by his confidant, Tobias Lear, he gave expression to no religious sentiment or prayer of any kind. But he faced death with unruffled calm and resignation, saying, "I die hard, but I am not afraid to go." At all events, Washington's religion, whatever may have been its inadequacies from a strictly Christian point of view, was held consistently and proved genuine enough to react in practical ways on his conduct in life.¹⁵

Certainly it is beyond dispute that Washington was not in any manner at all a religious bigot. It is significant, though of course intrinsically not proof positive of his freedom from anti-Catholic prejudice, that he counted numerous Catholics among his friends. Such were Bishop John Carroll, Charles Carroll of Carrollton,

Colonel John Fitzgerald, Stephen Moylan, and several members of the Digges family of Prince George's County, Maryland. In his *Diaries* Washington records eleven visits paid by him to Fitzgerald, his favorite aide-de-camp in the Revolutionary War, and some thirty received from Fitzgerald at Mount Vernon.¹⁶ With the Digges family, especially Ignatius and William, whose estate of Warburton lay a short distance across the Potomac from Mount Vernon, he was on terms of intimacy, as the *Diaries* reveal. Four visits of his to Ignatius Digges are noted.¹⁷ Thus, "[September 21, 1771] Dined at Mr. Willm. Digge's and lodged at Mr. Ignatis Digges." Father Thomas Digges, of this venerable Maryland Catholic family, a Jesuit for forty-nine years, lived to be ninety-four, dying in 1804 at Elmwood, a Digges estate across the Potomac from Mount Vernon. Bishop Carroll, visiting him a year before his demise, found him still mentally alert and eager to rehearse his associations with the old line of Jesuit missions in Maryland.¹⁸ Charles Carroll of Carrollton, Catholic signer of the Declaration of Independence, was associated with Washington in life-long friendship. Yet contacts between the two in the general's later life seem to have been infrequent. Strangely enough the *Diaries* mention no visit of Carroll's to Mount Vernon, though this silence is not strictly conclusive in view of the numerous gaps occurring in those records. But the *Diaries* do mention the presence at Mount Vernon, March 27, 1798, of the signer's son, Charles Carroll, Jr. On this occasion, it appears, the young man was earnest in paying his attentions to Washington's adopted daughter, Eleanor (Nelly) Parke Custis, so that a rumor of a match between them began to circulate. Eleanor's brother, George Parke Custis, then a student at St. John's, Annapolis, wrote promptly to Washington, eagerly indorsing the match and lauding Carroll to the skies. Martha Washington, according to Washington Irving, "countenanced" the union, but Washington himself frowned on it, having other plans in view in behalf of the young lady. His pointed reply to his step-son's perfervid communication had the effect of stopping the rumor.¹⁹

The year before Washington died he was host at Mount Vernon to the future Bishop Du Bourg, noted in later years as the aggressive and far-seeing builder of Catholicism in the trans-Mississippi West. "[July 8, 1798]. Dr. Craik, Wife and Son, a Mr. Craig of Alexa.[ndria], and Mr. de Bourg, President of the college at George Town, another of the Professors and two of the Studts. viz a son of Mr. Low's and a Neph. of Barry's dined here and all retd."²⁰ Washington, it is pleasant to re-

¹³ *Op. cit.*, 64.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, loc. cit. According to De la Bedoyere (p. 65) the following three sayings of Washington "sum up his attitude to God: (i) It is impossible to reason without arriving at a Supreme Being; (ii) The determinations of Providence are always wise, often inscrutable; and though its decrees appear to bear hard upon us at times it is none the less meant for gracious purposes; (iii) 'I shall always strive to be a faithful and impartial patron of vital religion.'" De la Bedoyere gives no specific references for these sayings. It is only fair, however, to note here that the evidence for Washington's not having been a Christian in the technical sense is negative only. He did, October 19, 1765, take oath to "conform to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England as by law established." and all through life retained active membership in this church. Chief Justice Marshall thought him a "sincere believer in the Christian faith and a devout man." His adopted daughter, Eleanor Parke Custis, testified: "I should have thought it the greatest heresy to doubt his [Washington's] firm belief in Christianity. His life, his writings prove that he was a Christian." Sparks, *Writings of Washington*, XII, 406. The evidence tending to show that Washington was a Christian, however that term is to be understood in this connection, is brought together in William J. Johnson, *George Washington, The Christian* (New York-Cincinnati, 1919). Cf. also Sparks, *op. cit.*, XII, 399-411.

¹⁵ Sixteenth of the Rules of Civility reads: "When you speak of God and his Attributes, let it be seriously and with Reverence." This rule, comments Fitzpatrick, "was certainly remembered. Though in his letters Washington uses the word God very seldom, his references to the Almighty, the Ruler of the Universe, Providence or the Supreme Being are frequent, and in the General Orders of the Revolution and many of his letters to friends there is nothing left to be desired on this point" (p. 23).

¹⁶ John C. Fitzpatrick (Ed.), *The Diaries of George Washington* (4 v., Boston, 1925), index. Cf. also Joseph P. Donnelly, S.J., "Colonel John Fitzgerald," *HISTORICAL BULLETIN* (St. Louis University), VII (May, 1929), 61-63.

¹⁷ *Diaries*, I, 34.

¹⁸ Thomas A. Hughes, S.J., *History of the Society of Jesus in North America, Colonial and Federal* (Text, 2 v., Documents, 2 v., New York, 1907-1917), Text, II, 691; John Carroll to William Strickland, S.J., August 4, 1804, Archives, English Province of the Society of Jesus.

¹⁹ *Diaries*, IV, 273. The correspondence on the subject between Washington and Custis is in Benson J. Lossing (ed.), *Memoirs of Washington by his Adopted Son, George Washington Parke Custis* (New York, 1859), 101-3. According to Washington Irving (*Life of Washington*, V, Chap. XVI), Martha Washington "countenanced" the union in question.

²⁰ *Diaries*, IV, 280.

call, was no stranger to Georgetown College. Two grand-nephews of his, sons of his nephew Bushrod Washington, were students for a while in that institution, to which on one or other occasion the *Pater Patriae* was a visitor.²¹ It may be noted here that Georgetown was not at this period a Jesuit school, the Society of Jesus being non-existent in the United States during the years 1773-1805. The school, however, had been founded by former Jesuits with Bishop Carroll at their head, had a Jesuit tradition, and it has been continuously under Jesuit management since the restoration in 1805 of the Society of Jesus on American soil.

Besides having Catholic social contacts, Washington paid on occasion a visit to a Catholic church. These visits were ones of courtesy; they argued no attraction on Washington's part to Catholic ceremonial or doctrine. While attending the first Continental Congress in Philadelphia, 1774, he "went October 9 to the Presbyterian Meeting in the forenoon and Romish church in the afternoon." Thirteen years later, when attending the Constitutional Convention in the same city, he "went [May 27, 1787] to the Romish church for High Mass."²² He was not present, as is sometimes said, at the Mass of Thanksgiving and Te Deum after Yorktown in St. Mary's Church, Philadelphia, to which Congress was invited. Legend has it that both Washington and Lafayette attended this service, during which they crossed swords before the altar. As a matter of fact, both the American and French heroes were still at Yorktown on the day of the Mass, November 4, 1781.²³ One further item marginal to the content of this paragraph may be noted. Washington made a contribution of fifty dollars to the building of St. Augustine's Church in Philadelphia.²⁴

The story of Washington and his staff riding through the streets of Philadelphia on St. Patrick's Day with green sprigs in the lapels of their coats is held to be

fictitious, though there would have been no incongruity in his doing so, as he was a member of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick and occasionally attended their meetings. Thus the *Diaries* for June 18, 1787: "Dined at the Quarterly Meeting of the Sons of St. Patrick."²⁵ This organization was not a Catholic one. Its membership was made up largely of prominent Protestants of Philadelphia; a few Catholics belonged to it, for instance, Stephen Moylan, its first and last president, who was a trusted secretary and aide-de-camp to Washington. It was probably in deference to the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick as also to the Irish soldiers under his command that twice during the Revolutionary War the Continental Army observed St. Patrick's day by order of Washington, the countersign on both occasions being St. Patrick.

Repression of Anti-Catholic Bigotry

More significant than any of the data set out above for the bearing they have on Washington's attitude towards Catholicism is the stand he took at the beginning of the Revolution in repressing anti-Catholic bigotry. Having been appointed by the Continental Congress in June, 1775, Commander-in-Chief of the American forces, he entered on his duties at Cambridge, Massachusetts, the following July. One of the first charges imposed upon him in his new capacity was to execute an order of Congress for the dispatch of a military expedition to Canada "to relieve its oppressed inhabitants." The Americans thought them as ready as themselves to rise against the British, an impression which proved to be erroneous. The curious reaction of the colonists to the Quebec Act of 1774 which guaranteed to the Canadians the free exercise of their religion threw a wet blanket on any efforts they might make to win the latter to their side. Passage of the Act by the British Parliament had been the signal for widespread and violent outbursts of anti-Catholic intolerance, especially among the New Englanders. It was cried aloud in congressional addresses, in the press, in the pulpits, in pamphlets and broadsides that the grant of religious freedom to the Canadians was an outrage and the prelude to a similar foisting of Popery on the Americans themselves.

Congress in October, 1774, issued four addresses, two on the 21st, "To the Inhabitants of the British Colonies" and "To the People of Great Britain," and two on the 26th, "To the Inhabitants of the Province of Quebec" and a "Petition to the King." All four addresses with the exception of the one to the Canadians were anti-Catholic, especially the address, "To the People of Great Britain," which was drafted by the notorious bigot John Jay. In it he touched off Catholicism as "fraught with sanguinary and impious tenets" and as having "disbursed impiety, bigotry, persecution, murder and rebellion through every part of the world." The address to the Canadians, on the other hand, was couched in beguiling and insinuating terms; it reminded them that religious liberty was a natural right and therefore not a thing they owed to the British. A translation of this address into French made at Montreal was well received by the Canadians. But when the congressional address "To the People of Great Britain," with its tirades

²¹ "Augustus and Bushrod Washington, sons of Judge Bushrod Washington, nephew of the Washington, who were then residing at Mt. Vernon, entered Georgetown on April 8, 1793." Coleman Nevils, S.J., *Miniatures of Georgetown, 1634 to 1934, Tercentennial Causes* (Washington, 1935), 47; *ibid.*, 48, 381, 382; John G. Shea, *Memorial of the First Centenary of Georgetown College, D. C., Comprising a History of Georgetown College* (Washington, 1891), 23. Two visits of Washington to Georgetown are sometimes mentioned, an informal one, in which he was met by Father William Matthews, and a formal one, 1796, in which he was addressed in verse by the student, Robert Walsh, who recalled the incident in a letter to Edward Everett (Nevils, *op. cit.*, 382). Shea, *loc. cit.*, writes as though Washington visited the college only once, namely, in 1796, this being also the occasion on which Father Matthews met and conversed with him. The Washington *Diaries* record no visit of their author to Georgetown; but no certain inference can be drawn from their silence in this regard, as there are frequent interruptions in them, e. g., the year, 1796, dropping out entirely.

²² *Diaries*, II, 167; III, 219. The church Washington visited on the two occasions was St. Mary's, Fourth Street near Spruce, Philadelphia. Martin I. J. Griffin thought it likely that Washington attended services in St. Mary's a third time, this being on occasion of the requiem Mass for the Spanish agent, Juan de Miralles, May 8, 1780.

²³ Martin I. J. Griffin, *Catholics and the American Revolution* (3 v., Philadelphia, 1907-1911), I, 315. Griffin had serious limitations as an historian, but the work here cited, as also the *American Catholic Historical Researches*, which he edited, contain a mass of valuable data not elsewhere available. His chief trait as an historian was honesty, which led him to expose with relish the exaggerations and myths often current in traditional history.

²⁴ *American Catholic Historical Researches* (Philadelphia), XXI (October, 1904), 167.

²⁵ *Diaries*, III, 222.

against the Catholic Church, was translated and read to them, they broke out into curses: "Oh the perfidious, double-faced Congress!"²⁶ The result was that Canada decided to remain neutral in the struggle. To this issue the influence of Bishop Briand of Quebec and his clergy was also, to say the least, a contributing factor. To that prelate, alarmed by the religious intolerance of the "Bostonnais," and convinced thereby that Catholic interests in Canada would be best served by preserving the political *status quo*, more than one historian gives the credit of having saved Canada for the British Empire. Further, historians of note, Claude H. Van Tyne among them, hold as well-founded the view that the American Revolution was in its initial stages partly an anti-Catholic movement. "No King, no Popery," was the slogan of the men who set the War of Independence on its way.²⁷

Even after the Canadians had expressed their resentment against the anti-Catholic excesses of the American colonists, it was imagined by the latter that an expedition sent into Canada would still see its inhabitants or many of them flock to the rebel colors. Washington, on whom it devolved to organize and despatch the expedition, was in an awkward position and he knew it.²⁸ He had himself as a member of the Continental Congress put his signature to the anti-Catholic addresses. Apparently in the heated state of public opinion he could not easily have taken a stand against them, if indeed it had ever occurred to him to do so. But that he personally shared their rabid anti-Catholic sentiments is not to be supposed. His entire career, public and private, was marked by a consistent practice of the principle of religious toleration, by a respect for other people's beliefs. Nor was his practice of religious tolerance based on mere considerations of expediency or policy. It was, so his words and actions lead us to infer, inspired by a reasoned conviction of the justice of the grounds on which the principle of freedom of worship in communities of mixed beliefs finds its support.²⁹ Hence, now that the Canadian venture was about to be launched, Washington was determined that no display of anti-Catholic feeling should be allowed its participants. Under date of September 14, 1775, he addressed to Colonel Benedict Arnold a body of instructions, one of which reads:

As the contempt of the religion of a country by ridiculing any of its ceremonies or affronting its ministers or votaries has ever been deeply resented, you are to be particularly careful to

restrain every officer and soldier from such imprudence and folly and to punish every instance of it. On the other hand, as far as lies in your power you are to protect and support the free exercise of the religion of the country and the undisturbed enjoyment of the rights of conscience in religious matters, with your utmost influence and authority.³⁰

Arnold, it may be remarked, stood in need of some such admonitions from his commander-in-chief. His hostility to the Catholic Church was well known. Perhaps Washington sought to conciliate him by reminding him that "common prudence, policy and a true Christian spirit will lead us to look with compassion on their [i.e. the Canadians'] errors."³¹ If reference is here made to the Canadians' religion, it is, as far as known, the only disparaging remark ever made by Washington about the Catholic faith. In the same instructions to Arnold the commander-in-chief also enjoins him to be "very cautious of violating the rules of conscience in others, ever considering that God alone is the judge of the heart of man and to Him only in this case are they answerable."³² The whole case for religious toleration could not be more happily stated.

At the same time that Washington was thus cautioning his subordinate against spoiling things by permitting any exhibition of bigotry among his troops, he addressed, September, 1775, an open letter to "the inhabitants of Canada," copies of which in English and French were to be carried by the invading American troops for distribution among the Canadians. The letter or address was fervid in its appeal to the Canadians to make common cause with the Americans. The praises of liberty and self-government were sung and British tyranny was decried as an evil from which the peoples on either side of the border should shake themselves free. The address concludes:

I have despatched Colonel Arnold into your country with a part of the Army under my command. I have enjoined it upon him, and I am certain that he will consider himself and act as in the country of his patrons and best friends. Necessaries and accommodations of every kind which you may furnish he will thankfully receive and render the full value. I write you, therefore, as friends and brethren, to provide him with such supplies as your country affords; and I pledge myself not

²⁹ "The liberty enjoyed by the people of the States of worshipping Almighty God agreeably to their conscience is not only among the choicest of their blessings, but also of their rights." Address of Washington to the Catholics cited *infra*. According to Joseph Gurn, *Charles Carroll of Carrollton, 1737-1832* (New York, 1932), 141, "Washington was not always favorably disposed towards Catholics, which was only to be expected in view of the manner in which Catholic beliefs and practices were misrepresented under the British regime." Gurn (*loc. cit.*) quotes Bradley T. Johnson as declaring in his *Washington* (Great Commander Series) that "he [Washington] entered the struggle against England with a feeling of hostility to the French and the Catholics, but that he emerged therefrom a warm friend of both."

³⁰ Jared Sparks (ed.), *The Writings of George Washington* (12 v., Boston, 1833-1837), III, 89.

³¹ Metzger, *op. cit.*, 127.

²⁶ Metzger, *Quebec Act*, 160.

²⁷ Most thoroughgoing and best documented treatment of the reaction of the American colonists to the Quebec Act is Charles H. Metzger, S.J., *The Quebec Act: A Primary Cause of the American Revolution* (United States Catholic Historical Society, Monograph Series, XVI, New York, 1936). See also Claude Van Tyne, "The Influence of the Clergy and of Religion and Sectarian Forces on the American Revolution," *American Historical Review*, XIX (October 1913), 44-64; Griffin, *op. cit.*, III, 384-89.

²⁸ Washington's personal attitude towards the Quebec Act cannot be ascertained. The only statement of his on the subject occurs in a letter written to his brother John from the camp at Cambridge, October 13, 1775, in which he speaks of "the diabolical scheme which was constructed" upon the "Canada Bill." Worthington C. Ford, *The Writings of George Washington* (12 v., New York and London, 1889-1893, III, 180. But, as Father Metzger comments (*op. cit.*, 126, n. 264), the reference may be, not to its religious clauses, but to the check it put on speculation in western lands, in which Washington was greatly interested.

³² *Ibid.*, *loc. cit.* As things turned out, the conduct of the American soldiers in Canada was not satisfactory. According to Griffin, *op. cit.*, I, 220, Canada was "lost" for three reasons: (1) because she had no just cause to revolt; (2) because Bishop Briand kept the priests and people loyal to the civil authority; (3) because the Americans did not know how to behave themselves and were not strong enough in force to hold the country." Cf. also a letter of Washington to General Sullivan, June 16, 1776: "I am convinced that many of our misfortunes are to be attributed to a want of discipline and a proper regard to the conduct of our soldiery. Hence it was, and from our feeble efforts to protect the Canadians that they had almost joined and taken part against us." Sparks, *The Writings of George Washington* (III, 423).

only for your safety and security, but for an ample compensation. Let no man desert his habitation. Let no one flee as before an enemy. The cause of America and of liberty is the cause of every virtuous American citizen; whatever may be his religion or his descent, the United Colonies know no distinction but such as slavery, corruption and arbitrary domination may create. Come, then, ye generous citizens, range yourselves under the standard of general liberty, against which all the force and artifices of tyranny will never be able to prevail.³³

No one will blame Washington for making the best of a bad situation by "side-stepping" the actual antagonism of the people of New England to things Catholic. Obviously, that the colonists knew no distinction of persons "but such as slavery, corruption and arbitrary domination may create" was a claim that had little basis in fact. Violent resentment provoked among the colonists by the toleration clauses of the Quebec Act pointed to the contrary.

Later in the same year Washington again took a stand against the current anti-Catholic complex. In England Guy Fawkes Day, November 5, commemorated the attempt made in 1605 under James I to blow up the House of Parliament with the King and assembled members. It's American counterpart, "Pope Day," also observed on November 5, was, like the English affair, an occasion for the display of rabid anti-Catholic prejudice. The New-Englanders were especially zealous in celebrating the day in question and in 1774 had, in the wake of the resentment provoked by the Quebec Act, shown particular zest in its observance. Learning of the intention of the Continental Army camped near Boston to stage a demonstration on "Pope Day," Washington issued an order dated November 5, 1775:

As the commander-in-chief has been apprised of a design formed for the observance of that ridiculous and childish custom of burning the effigy of the Pope, he cannot help expressing his surprise that there should be officers and soldiers in his army so void of common sense as not to see the impropriety of such a step at such a juncture and in such circumstances. To be insulting their religion is so monstrous as not to be suffered or excused; indeed, instead of offering the most remote insult, it is our duty to address public thanks to these our brethren, as to them we are so much indebted for every late happy success on the common enemy in Canada.³⁴

It does not appear that the American troops in Canada gave offence to its inhabitants on religious grounds, at least in any notable way. But they did, it would seem, make themselves unwelcome in other ways and this was accounted one of the reasons of their ill-success (*supra*, note 32).

³³ Griffin, *op. cit.*, I, 275.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, I, 213.

(To be continued in next issue)

Herodotus: Historian and Humorist

(Cont. from page fifty-four)

Babylonia, especially its amazing fertility, he breaks in to remark²⁰ that he knows all this must sound incredible to stay-at-homes who never visited the place. In other words, to the hearer's protest, "You can't tell me that!" he calmly replies with the Baron's crushing rejoinder, "Vass you der, Scharlie?"

Perhaps the best of all Herodotus' "whoppers" is the travelers' tale of the wondrous oxen of Garamantia.²¹ They are like ordinary oxen he says, except in the fine

quality of their hides. But they have this remarkable feature, that their huge horns curve forward and stick into the ground, so that they have to — back up in grazing!²²

Another of Herodotus' prize jokes is the fable²³ that certain Egyptian fish, which swim out to sea for spawning, are always found to have peculiar little scars on their heads — on the left side if caught while on their way down to sea, on the right side if taken while returning up the Nile. The reason is, he tries to make us believe, that they cling close to the shore, ever bumping their heads against the bank, so as not to lose their way.

It is hard to see why anybody would maintain that Herodotus is solemnly serious in all this, or in his comical report of the way cinnamon is gathered in Arabia.²⁴ Wonderful and amazing, he says, is the natives' account. They claim that no one has yet discovered where the cinnamon tree grows, but that certain great birds bring it in, seemingly from the regions where Dionysus was brought up (i.e., Ethiopia). These birds use the wood in building their vast nests, high up on a sheer crag which no human foot may scale. But the shrewd Arabs have found out an artifice for obtaining the precious sticks. They cut up any oxen which may have died, into huge ponderous sections which they carry to that crag and leave at its foot. Thereupon they withdraw a bit and hide. The birds at once swoop down, and carry the pieces of meat with much difficulty up to their nests. But so heavy is the weight, that the nests break off under the new burden and fall to the ground. The Arabs immediately return, gather up the cinnamon sticks, and sell them throughout the world.

Amusing Customs

A fourth kind of humorous passage to be enjoyed in this remarkable history is the description of laughable events and customs which Herodotus has heard of, or himself observed in his broad travels. It is the custom of the Persians, he relates,²⁵ to take counsel on weighty matters twice — once when sober, another time when, well . . . rather the opposite. Only such things as please them in both states will they carry into execution.

Every reader, surely, has laughed at the episode which Herodotus includes in his account of the great battle of Marathon.²⁶ The traitor Hippias, he tells us, being an old man with several loose teeth, happened to sneeze too vigorously and lose one of them. As he could not locate where it fell, he concluded that it was an omen, signifying that his only hold on the land of Greece was the bit of earth which his lost tooth covered. And so it turned out in the event.

"What cares Hippocleides?" has become a proverb

²² Even this story pales into triteness compared to the widespread Greek tale of the fabulous tribe of Awning-Feet who lived in mysterious Libya. They had webbed feet like geese, so that on lying down for a siesta they would hold one up in the air as an awning against the equatorial sun (see Aristophanes, *Birds* 1553, and the ancient Scholia thereto). Pliny (*Natural History* 7.2.23) improves on the tale by ascribing to them only one foot—which they used alternately as leaping-pole or sunshade.

²³ 2.93.

²⁴ 3.111.

²⁵ 1.133.

²⁶ 6.107.

²⁰ 1.193.

²¹ 4.183.

for nonchalance because of the event which Herodotus records at the court of Sicyon.²⁷ The tyrant Cleisthenes was holding a banquet for the numerous suitors of his fair daughter. After the meal, the young rivals vied for her hand by various feats of music and skill. Presently, as the drinking advanced, Hippocleides leaped onto a table and called out to the flute-player to strike up a lively tune, to which he danced most agilely, and, as he thought, exceeding well. But when Cleisthenes saw him shamelessly dancing on the table, and standing on his head with legs waving about in the air, he could no longer restrain his indignation, and cried out, "Son of Tisander, you have danced away a wife!" But he laughed off the calamity (?) with the remark, "What cares Hippocleides for that?"

Humorous Elaborations

Droll elaborations of curious facts form a fifth class of humor in Herodotus. 'Why Egyptians have thick skulls' is a problem entered into²⁸ with a zest which betrays the historian's amusement. He considers the Egyptians' own explanation plausible — that it is due to their custom of shaving the head from earliest childhood, so that under the action of the blazing sun the bones grow thick and hard. Curiously enough, this same practice, he affirms, also reduces baldness in Egypt to a world minimum.

On the other hand, we are told²⁹ that the Ethiopians have of all men the 'woolliest' hair. The adjective is Herodotus' own; it must have seemed as quaint to him as it does to us.

This irrepressible humorist also, it would seem, liked to tease the ladies. For in his history of the wars between Athens and Aegina, he plays the wag at their expense.³⁰ Of an Athenian expedition, he writes, only one man returned alive. But he was then set upon by the women, who, in their anger over their slain husbands, stuck the poor fellow with their long brooch pins until he died. Thereupon the terrified Athenians passed a law that their women must no longer wear dresses with such pins, whereas the delighted Aeginetans passed a law enlarging them.

Herodotus sees another good joke in the story of the Persian retreat after Salamis.³¹ To save the great king's own ship in a storm, its pilot ordered all the cargo jettisoned. But as that did not suffice, he bade the Persian nobles on board to jump into the sea. The ship, thus lightened, reached land safely. Thereupon Xerxes summoned his pilot and gave him a great reward for saving his life; but he also cut off his head for doing it by causing the death of so many noble Persians.

When narrating the battle of Plataea, Herodotus notes two stories about the Athenian hero Sophanes.³² One was that he carried into battle a huge anchor fastened to his belt, which he would throw down when attacked, so that it would be impossible to dislodge him from his post. But whenever he prevailed over a foe, he would hoist up the anchor and carry it with him in hot pursuit

of the enemy. The other account was that this anchor was merely painted as a device on his shield. It is characteristic, both of Herodotus' critical effort to present the truth, and of his sense of humor, that here, as often elsewhere, he tells both stories — but puts the funny one first.

Pleasantries

We may notice, as a last point, a few instances where Herodotus explicitly laughs at his own jokes. The Seythians, he says,³³ maintain on oath that their neighbors, the Neuroi, each year turn into wolves for a few days, then revert to human form. "But they don't convince me," he slyly explains, "despite all their oaths; nevertheless, they go right on telling the story. . . . I think these Neuroi must be conjurers."

So too, he refuses to believe the tale that Scyllias swam eighty stades (i.e., about seven miles) under water from Aphetae to Artemisium without once coming up. But he does not, you notice, refuse to tell of it.³⁴

Similarly, of geographers' maps showing the earth with the river Ocean flowing all around it, he says³⁵ I laugh whenever I see one of them, noting how none of them adduces any rational proof of the idea.

Finally,³⁶ he laughs at the picture of Alcmeon, who, being told by Croesus that he might have as much gold from the royal treasury as he could carry, came forth with gold stuffed into his outlandishly large buskins and cloak (specially put on for the occasion), and with gold-dust sprinkled among his hair, and crammed into his mouth. Croesus laughed at the sight. And why not? For, Herodotus remarks with a smile,

He looked like anything rather than a man, and was puffed out all over to many times his normal size.

Epilogue

No one should conclude from this partial catalogue of wit and humor in Herodotus that his *History* is only an amusing joke book in Greek. There are also in it sad stories, and dramatic scenes of high power. It is, in general, sober history of great worth and accuracy. It is also a treasure-house of important archaeological, geographic, and anthropological data, and full of information valuable to economic history. From its pages, we may gain deep insight into the character and remarkable significance of the Greek people. The humorous passages are included primarily to lend variety, appeal, and humane viewpoint to the long narrative. Their presence is one more indication of the author's fine literary taste and splendid artistry in maintaining life and interest throughout his work.

There are, then, many admirable features which recommend Herodotus' book to historians, and counsel its class-room use for illuminating, and lending appeal to ancient history. But none is so unusual and so characteristically Herodotean as this pervading spirit of gentle, kindly humor, which suffuses over the entire work a delightful charm and humanity. This, surely, suffices even by itself to make one desirous of reading the whole work through — or, if one's education has been more fortunate, re-reading it.

²⁷ 6.129.

²⁸ 3.12.

²⁹ 7.70.

³⁰ 5.87-88.

³¹ 8.118.

³² 9.74.

³³ 4.105.

³⁴ 8.8.

³⁵ 4.36.

³⁶ 6.125.

Book Reviews

Secret History of the American Revolution, by Carl Van Doren. New York. Viking Press. 1941. pp. xiv + 534. \$3.75

All the apparatus of an Oppenheim exciter—plus truth—is to be found in this book. Gentlemanly rebels, opportunistic public servants, class haters, ruffianly loyalists, poet-spies, Parliamentary placemen, slanderers, dupes, double-dealers, noble lords, codes, secret inks—arranged in chronological order and you have the underworld of war. Mr. Van Doren has had the enviable privilege of working through the secret service documents among the headquarters papers of Sir Henry Clinton. This book is the result of those studies. Van Doren's technique is to describe briefly the well known superstructure of the war, and then to excavate below the ground level, revealing previously unknown burrows, tunnels of treason, and secret communications. Not all of the story is new, but very much of it is.

Reviewers in the service of the "general public" have found it pedestrian in part. The "special" but large public which has an acquaintance with the revolution will not find it so. It is a series of episodes tied together only by the persistent, long-range British attempt to play on the vanity or titillate the pocket nerves of American revolutionaries, high and low. The story cannot be told in any more connected and easily understood form because, as the author said, "There is seldom any simple truth in treason" (p. 143).

Most interesting, and probably most important, is the new material on Arnold's treachery. The writer does a good job of presenting the public knowledge of Arnold's career. Then he exposes the secret service negotiations which have not previously been known except in manuscript in the Clements library (Ann Arbor). The publication of the Arnold-André correspondence (including letters from many other persons) and of Clinton's narrative, written in 1780, is of great value. Some exposition of the fact that the Revolution in Pennsylvania was something very like a class war would have helped to explain the antipathy of Pennsylvania Whigs toward Arnold, whose taste for the company of "the wise, the good, and the rich" has been well known. Mr. Van Doren's marshalling of the facts of Arnold's relationships with alleged Philadelphia Tories leads this reader to suspect that a rather venomous display of class hatred—directed against elegant, ambitious Arnold—was the immediate cause of Arnold's inexcusable fall from grace. This conclusion is, of course, no extenuation of the conduct of a man for whom it is hard to feel anything but dislike after reading his mail.

The word "hatred" best describes the Pennsylvania Whig attitude which came closer to persecution than prosecution of Arnold. All this at a time when he had certainly been indiscreet and perhaps criminal, but not traitorous—yet. The most important point established by the author, in this reader's judgment, is this: Arnold came over to the British with full freedom of will. He was not seduced from his proper loyalties, but chose treason in cold blood. Of Arnold's later apology that he was moved to abandon the American cause by scruples over the Declaration of Independence and the French alliance, it is clearly demonstrated that he said not a syllable in protest of these things before he resolved to sell himself, in May, 1779.

Arnold appears to have been an habitual liar. He lied under oath to the fellow officers of his court of inquiry, he lied to the patriot public in his announcement of his conversion to loyalism, he lied to the British commissioners who were employed in sifting his claims to indemnification for the losses suffered by turning his coat. Washington's famous statement of Arnold's character—"He wants feeling!"—was almost an understatement. A previously unpublished letter from Arnold to Clinton only thirteen days after André's execution (André was one of Clinton's closest friends) showed Arnold haggling over the bribe promised him for his attempted betrayal of West Point and delivery of Washington into British hands.

But the book is not all Arnold; he was merely the biggest fish netted by the British secret service. Franklin, Schuyler, Israel Putnam, and many others were approached. One British memorandist thought Washington's anger at Arnold was due to Arnold's having gotten into the British bribe chest before him. While reading the book one almost began to fear what Van Doren might have discovered and it is with something of relief that it is noted that the Conway caballists were military politicians, not traitors. Sullivan, Rush, R. H. Lee, Mifflin,

and James Wilkinson either withstood offers or were not approached (Wilkinson was probably as yet too immature a scoundrel to get a chance). Gates was somewhat obscurely involved in a scheme to ransom the Burgoyne army, at some financial profit to himself, although the deal did not come off and might have been merely shady, rather than criminal. Charles Lee, according to Van Doren, was not treasonable but looked on the war as a political squabble which could be best settled by a compromise. (Lee, of course, would be the meritorious mediator.) But he was so anxious to please the British commanders that he "was bound to lack spontaneity and fire in attacking British soldiers" (p. 35). It is well to remember that this acquittal of Lee by Van Doren is based on the absence of any treasonable correspondence in the secret service files. Lee may well have had an oral understanding. Certainly his conduct at Monmouth was actually more profitable to the British than anything Arnold accomplished for them. Of Silas Deane there is not much new, but there is a good collation of previously known facts, showing his almost constant connection with the King's friends, and pointing out that by 1781 Deane was an extreme loyalist.

Mr. Van Doren, in conclusion, says of the loyalists, "There was only one essential quality in which the loyalists surpassed the patriots. That quality was conservatism." And of the tempted patriots, "The wonder is—as Washington understood—not that some of them were false but that most of them were true to the ragged colours of a perilous cause." The ragged flags of righteous but perilous causes have cracked in the winds of every century and nearly every man has faced or will face the choice: whether to sell or follow his particular flag. From Judas to Quisling, Arnold does not lack company.

Facsimiles of documents and contemporary portraits make the text attractive. The notes are gathered in twelve pages at the end. This makes for somewhat awkward use as a bibliographical reference, but the inconvenience has been minimized by printing the chapter number in the center of each double page of text. The map of the Arnold-André country (facing p. 283) has a number of place names which are illegible, even under a library glass. The author refers frequently to loyalist Thomas Jones' contemporary history, although he does not appear to have used the work usually attributed to Charles Stedman, which might have been useful to him as a sampling of loyalist opinion and apologetics. It seems worth noting also that this is not the first time that the Clinton papers have been used, although the book gives that impression. Bellamy Partridge in his *Sir Billy Howe* (1932) published an explanation of the ambiguous letter from Clinton to Burgoyne just before the latter's capitulation, which explanation relied on the use of a secret letter-mask used by the two men, presumably in the secret service papers.

As said above, not all of this book is new, but very much of it is. This reviewer takes a comfortable seat on the end of the limb and ventures the opinion that Van Doren has by this book added more to our knowledge of the American Revolution than any book published since the death of the eminent Van Tyne. Documents of the period which are previously unknown and also are of first importance turn up rarely nowadays. Van Doren has a whole book full of them!

MARSHALL SIELSER

The Crusade of Richard Lion-Heart, by Ambroise.

Translated from the Old French by Merton Jerome Hubert. New York. Columbia U. Press. 1941. pp. xi + 478. \$4.00

With the publication of this book the editors of the Columbia University series, *RECORDS OF CIVILIZATION*, present another work of *Sources and Studies in Medieval History*. Translated from the Old French by Merton Jerome Hubert and documented by John L. La Monte, the *Estoire de la guerre sainte* of Ambroise will be appreciated by the medievalist, historian and literateur.

The authors have preserved in the presentation of the epic of Richard's Crusade in English and in poetic form, the spirit, style, and rhyme of the original, as well as the thought, prejudices, and imagery of the medieval jongleur. The lengthy critical introduction and documentation which consists of abundant notes and cross-references to other sources enhance the value of the work for the historian.

R. VOLLENWEIDER

Writing History, by Sherman Kent. New York. Crofts. 1941. pp. xii + 136. \$1.00

Every now and then a little gem of workmanship appears among the thousands of books published every year. The characteristics of such a work are usually brevity (relative, of course, to the extent of the subject treated), a conciseness and definiteness of concept, and a foresight which seems to forestall all reasonable expectations of the reader. This little handbook appears to have all these qualities.

The purpose of the author was primarily to relieve fretting teachers directing students in the writing of their undergraduate theses. It might just as well serve as a convenient and interestingly written summary of principles for anyone writing history from a freshman term paper to a monumental history. Packed into these few pages are the most important answers to "why history," "how to find a topic," "how to proceed in the collection and organization of material," "how to write history with clarity and distinction," together with the most important rules of style and usage. And where the handbook leaves off, the author indicates further leads with excellent critical bibliographical notes in which any student can plumb any detail well beyond his depth. The bibliographical essay which appends the book on historical method, science, philosophy, and historiography is certainly the best thing of its kind which this reviewer has ever seen.

Perhaps some will disagree with certain details, especially in the chapter on "Why History." However, I believe no teacher will examine this book and not agree with this reviewer that no library should neglect laying in a number of copies for the benefit of its students.

R. L. PORTER

Federal Administrative proceedings, by Walter Gellhorn. Baltimore. The Johns Hopkins University Press. 1941. pp. 150. \$2.00

Ever since the time of the Courts of Star Chamber in Cromwellian times English common law has had a bitter antipathy towards quasi-judicial bodies. Judicial opinion in the United States has treated the administrative courts with unmistakable suspicion; but latterly the need of specialists and experts to deal with the intricate and ever-increasing economic and social problems of the nation has forced the courts and the legal profession as a whole to change the traditional attitude. In this book of lectures—the James Schouler Lectures in History and Political Science for 1941—Doctor Gellhorn defends the administrative court, as it functions in the United States, against many of the evils that have been attributed to it by lawyers and others. He shows that under conditions obtaining in this country there is little evil resulting from the combination of prosecutor, judge, and administrator in one body, and there are numerous examples cited from various bureaucratic procedures, all of which go far towards making out a case in defense of these governmental agencies. While much of the work has to do with arguments of this nature, there are significant passages, where the author points out the fact that these administrative courts are entered upon a new stage of development, in which, no longer forced to fight for their existence, they will be able to develop their methods of procedure along more efficient and scientific lines.

The author's defense of the administrative court as found in the United States is a good one, and, with the exception of the parts dealing with a common objection—the combination of judge and prosecutor in the same office—his arguments are most convincing. However, the author takes for granted that the State is the proper authority for dealing with the minutiae of economic adjustments. This premise is founded upon the mechanistic principle that the individual must deal directly with the State in these matters, and anyone who agrees with the natural, organic view of society as held by the corporative school will find the book, while excellent as a piece of argumentative scholarship, considerably beside the point.

JAMES F. HANLEY

The United States and Civilization, by John U. Nef. University of Chicago Press. 1942. pp. xviii + 421. \$3.00

This is the best volume in the Walgreen Lecture series; at least it is the best we have seen thus far. It is, as such books should be, a by-product of deeper and wider studies in a special field by a man who knows that life is bigger than any of its departments. The research of Professor Nef in industrial history enables him to speak with authority on the subject. He is an

economist who puts economics in its proper place. He is an historian who attaches a higher value to moral philosophy than to the gathering of surface facts. For him the glorification of economic factors, important though these factors may be, is a blind attempt to stand civilization on its head. For him human history divorced from truth, goodness and beauty is the degradation of man. He is a Humanist, and he seeks the cure for modern ills in humanistic education under his mentor, Robert Maynard Hutchins.

Humanism alone is not going to save the world. But it is a movement in the right direction; it is a movement upward out of the morass of materialism and animal evolution; it is a striving toward better things which we can admire and for which we are grateful. "History suggests," says Professor Nef, "that the great achievements of civilized societies have come when some struggling section of mankind has been carried forward by a magnificent conception of life, expressed for it most perfectly by a few saints and wise men." America needs to recover the eternal truths of Plato, Aristotle, Augustine and Aquinas. Here lies the remedy, no doubt, provided we go one step further and find Christ, human and divine.

We feel reassured when the author cites Gilson, Maritain, Newman, Pascal and Saint Francis de Sales, as well as a few wholesome specialists, including himself. We have heard, and said, a hundred times that "civilization is at the cross-roads," that the present "lost generation" has pitifully missed the purpose and meaning of life, that the triumph of the machine marks the close of an old era rather than the beginning of a new era. But it is good to have the sweeping conclusions of amateur historians and mere "writers" confirmed by a scholar who has dug far below the surface of our industrial age. We are grateful for a tribute to philosophy, art and religion (however inadequate) from an economic historian. We listen willingly to a discussion of education, democracy and international justice by an author who is convinced that man lives by bread, but not by bread alone.

R. CORRIGAN

With Napoleon in Russia, by General de Caulaincourt. New York. Morrow. 1935. pp. v + 286.

No Peace with Napoleon, by General de Caulaincourt. New York. Morrow. 1936. pp. xxiv + 422. (2 copies, boxed ed. \$5.00)

Some six years ago William Morrow and Company of New York published two volumes of the memoirs of General de Caulaincourt: *With Napoleon in Russia* and *No Peace With Napoleon!* Although these memoirs are not new to the reading public, it is nevertheless fitting to call attention to them again for they constitute one of the outstanding pieces of Napoleonic historiography.

At a time when interest in Russia runs high and the whole world waits anxiously to learn the final outcome of the German campaign in that country, the appearance of these volumes in a boxed edition is most opportune. The Duke of Vicenza was the intimate and trusted confidant of Napoleon throughout the entire Russian campaign and acted as his representative in the affairs of state preceding Fontainebleau and the subsequent banishment to the lonely island of Elba. What he has written of those momentous days is of first importance to every conscientious student of history.

More than once have the evident comparisons between Napoleon and Hitler been pointed out, nor have the newspapers been slow in recognizing the direct analogy between the two Russian campaigns. A Russian winter ruined Napoleon; will it likewise prove the downfall of the Nazi Dictator? Time alone can tell, but not always does time hide her secrets.

Packed into these seven hundred odd pages of personal reflections and objective notations is a story filled with the glowing thrill of success and the bitter sting of unexpected defeat. It is a story of vaulting ambition, of international intrigue, of the deep ingratitude of traitors. Perchance the Little Corporal deserved what Fate had in store for him, perhaps he did aim at an impossible goal, but the reader cannot but despise the petty selfishness, the kotowing and timeserving of those who so eagerly betrayed him and their country into the hands of a common foe.

The memoirs, from the original memoirs as edited by Jean Hanoteau, are here presented in translated and abridged form by George Libaire who has done a commendable work of condensation and translation. Though the memoirs offer little new historical material, they are of real intrinsic value for the light they shed on the intimate thoughts and feelings of the great man.

The narrative is surprisingly frank and honest throughout. Caulaincourt pulled no punches as he wrote of the defects and shortcomings as well as the genius of Napoleon. As the titles indicate, the first volume deals with the horrors and sufferings of the invasion of Russia and the flight back to France, while the second treats especially of the Congress of Chatillon, the treachery of Napoleon's ministers, the unsuccessful attempt at suicide, and the prelude to Elba.

Students of history will find these memoirs a valuable aid to a better and more complete understanding of the mind and character of Napoleon I. Libraries whose shelves are still without a copy of the volumes will welcome the opportunity to purchase them at the new reduced price of \$5.00 a set.

E. H. KORTH

The War — Second Year, by Edgar McInnis. New York. The Oxford Press. 1941. pp. ix + 318, \$2.00

This is the second volume of the Oxford series of histories of the present war. Like its predecessor, it is a history only in the widest sense, since those data so necessary for the determination of ultimate causes are unavailable at the present time. Thorough treatment is given to air attack on England, the activities in the north of Africa, the Balkan and Russian campaigns, and the situation in the eastern Mediterranean theatre. These accounts are combined with outlines of Japanese policy, international diplomatic alignments, and internal adjustments in the occupied countries as well as in the United States. The reader who is fairly well informed on the progress of the war will find nothing new in these pages, but the work has been arranged with a degree of craftsmanship that will make it a valuable reference work. Well written, with an appendix containing copies of significant treaties and state papers, with a useful chronological outline, and an excellent index, this book seems to have attained the limited purpose of the author.

However, Professor McInnis might have done better than to confine himself to a mere narration, albeit from the British point of view, of these momentous events. There are only passing comments on the future significance of the momentous events that are narrated, whereas it would seem that a scholar of the author's recognized ability could give a more discerning analysis of these matters. In treating of the campaigns in Libya, for instance, he develops points which were of little significance in regard to the final outcome, omitting, the while, some details which gave an opportunity for both the Germans and the English to capitalize on diverse phases of the same situation. This detracts little from the merit of the book, since its purpose is in no way analytical.

JAMES F. HANLEY

The Charles, by Arthur Bernon Tourtellot. New York. Farrar & Rinehart. 1941. pp. x + 356. \$2.50

Here is a very readable book, one that you will want to finish in one sitting. The following quotation from the author's final chapter on sources gives a good indication of the book's content: "In preparing this work I have limited myself in various ways. I have, for example, not bothered much about repeating the happenings that belong to history in general, but have confined myself to their local or regional beginnings. This led, early in the work, to more extensive concern over the lesser lights in history, whom I found to be surprisingly important in their own rights. The men who challenged autocracy, the men who toiled in lowly printing shops, and the men who hammered for liberty in the infant newspapers seemed to me characteristic of early life in this valley, and as significant as the political leaders, the college presidents, and the generals."

The Charles is a book which is on the whole well conceived and well executed, and which constitutes a worthy addition to the "Rivers of America" Series. In his volume Mr. Tourtellot has succeeded in capturing for his readers the prevailing spirit of the Charles Valley down through the years. Although the book is the result of scholarly effort, it is best suited to the taste of the average reader. The specialized student and scholar will be mainly interested in the author's commendable bibliography.

URBAN J. KRAMER

Maryknoll Mission Letters, by Rev. Maurice Duffy, John McLoughlin, etc. New York. Field Afar Press. 1942. pp. viii + 55. \$50

Of particular interest to all Catholics during the present Far East crisis is the status of Catholic missions in the war-infected areas. It was with this consideration in mind that the Field Afar Press recently published a modest volume of *Mission*

Letters, some twenty-three letters and excerpts received from various Maryknoll fathers in South China. Each of the fifty-five pages of the little book is packed with human interest, thrilling and heroic experiences, and not a little suffering.

In accordance with present plans, companion volumes will be published every six months and may be purchased separately. This first edition sells for fifty cents. Friends of Maryknoll are offered the advantage of a standing subscription of one dollar annually.

E. H. KORTH

Sons of the West, by Lorah B. Chaffin. Caldwell, Idaho. The Caxton Printers, Ltd. 1941. pp. 284. \$3.00

Great men and picturesque men who contributed to the making of Wyoming form the subject of this pleasing series of sketches. Some of these are well enough known; others the author has rescued from undeserved oblivion. Of the exploits of both she writes feelingly and interestingly. She has drawn materials from interviews, recollections, newspaper files and kindred sources valuable for local history. The work is quite abundantly illustrated. The few historical slips are, perhaps, typographical errors.

JOHN F. BANNON

War as a Social Institution, by Jesse D. Clarkson and Thomas C. Cochran. New York. Columbia University Press. 1941. pp. 333. \$3.50

In the light of what happened in the ensuing months these papers on war which were read at the meeting of the American Historical Association in December, 1940 have an exceptional interest. There is a bitter reminder of American folly in the paper by Benjamin H. Williams on American leadership in the non-totalitarian world. "When the Japanese in 1937 launched the most brutal imperialistic venture of modern times for the conquest of China, they looked abroad for the materials of war with which they were to crush the Chinese and found the greatest foreign source to be in the United States. In the three and one-half years since this bloody invasion began, industries of the United States have provided more than half of the Japanese imports of military supplies. The totalitarian blood-brothers of Japan, that is, Germany and Italy, have furnished almost nothing. It has remained for the greatest democracy, the United States, to produce oil, scrap iron, trucks, copper, and other requisites of warfare which have aided the Japanese to kill and wound some two millions of Chinese soldiers, to cause the death through starvation and disease of several millions of civilians, and to drive an enormous number of others, it may be fifty millions, from their homes."

The essays on the totalitarian states emphasized the inevitability of world war number two. "A program for wars of conquest is therefore the only logical or practical outcome of the adoption of Geopolitik as the basis on which government is erected. Such a program has been drawn up in detail, with terrifying naivete, by the geographer Banse. Briefly its thesis is this. Wars must be fought for Lebensraum."

Furthermore, in the essay by Colonel Herman Buekma this statement is made: "For the five hundred million people under totalitarian rule conscription has become the wartime extension of a peacetime social concept which reduces the individual to the status of a fraction of the state. He lives only in the contribution which he makes to the collective output of the whole, whether in goods or carnage."

Wars always leave undreamed of changes in their wake. This is the warning that the paper on War and Society gives. "There has been no case in which a modern totalitarian dictatorship has been the direct result of a war. Nevertheless, there is an important indirect relation between war and totalitarian dictatorship. The social, economic, and psychological crisis which follows a great war becomes also the cradle of totalitarian dictatorship."

With the resources of a nation at the command of the government one can appreciate the danger in that breathless period of reconstruction, whether by victor or vanquished, of falling the prey to leaders proud and ambitious or hating and vengeful.

A. H. SCHELLER

The Continental Congress, by Edmund Cody Burnett. New York. Macmillan. 1941. pp. xvii + 757. \$6.00

An adequate appreciation of the trials and obstacles confronting the colonies from the days of their determination to maintain their rights, cost what it may, to the attaining of majority of the young Republic with the adoption of the Constitution, of necessity requires a co-ordinating factor for the struggle and

efforts of the evolving nation. Such a combining element was the Continental Congress. Weak as it necessarily was, it was nevertheless the hub whence radiated the political, economic, and military efforts of a people determined at first to be free and finally to be sovereign since, so they had been persuaded, therein lay the only hope of freedom.

Dr. Burnett does a fine piece of scholarly work in developing chronologically the great drama of the birth of the United States of America as an independent government. The letters of the members of the Congresses, the official Journals of the Congresses and the writings of Washington, all drawn from quite freely, are incorporated into the text in such a manner as to provide for a comparatively smooth style. The necessity of footnotes and appendices has thus been obviated, and any further research that may be desirable can readily be made in the eight volumes of the author's: *Letters of Members of the Continental Congress*, as well as in other articles and studies mentioned in the author's preface.

The treatise is scholarly in its impartial viewpoint and presentation of controversial points, as for example the precise date of the signing and taking effect of the Declaration of Independence. It is a painstaking presentation of the attempts of a weakly organized representative body to carry on successfully a war for independence and to provide for some sort of unity among sovereign states. The period covered is to the time when the Constitution took effect and the new Federal government took its place among the governments of the world. The picture of the sessions is enhanced by the intimate expression of personal ambitions and fears, and the sharp character sketches drawn from the writings of the delegates. A dimension and shading, which a mere presentation of facts could hardly render, is thus imparted to the work. The molding influence which men of the caliber of Adams and Jefferson had in shaping the spirit for independence, is clearly made manifest, yet the unwavering determination of the colonies from the very first to shake off the yoke of oppression seems to gainsay those who insist that the War for Independence was entirely undesired and was foisted upon the colonies by a small pressure group.

The study fails in a point of considerable importance insofar as it neglects to set forth at least briefly the drafting of the Federal Constitution. The crown of the Congresses' efforts and the fruit of the War should be more fully presented in any work covering that period. It is the author's intention to devote a subsequent treatise to the contributions which the Continental Congress made to our present governmental structure, and so a phase of paramount interest and importance has been left undeveloped in a work which is otherwise complete and a valuable contribution to the history of the time.

JOSEPH P. FLANNER

Carlyle and the Saint-Simonians, by Hill Shine. Baltimore. Johns Hopkins Press. 1941. pp. xiii + 191. \$2.25

This book has all the appearances of a doctoral dissertation. As such it has passed, we assume, under the critical eyes of a competent board and has been formally declared a worthy contribution to the sum of human knowledge. The author has picked a problem of some importance and intrinsic interest, found and filtered the available facts, and finally presented his conclusions with modest conviction and in pleasing form. His theme is the influence upon Thomas Carlyle of the Saint-Simonian concept of historical periodicity. Biographers and literary critics have disagreed sufficiently to leave him a fair field. He contends that Carlyle, already moving in the wake of the greater Goethe, of Friederich von Schlegel and a few other Germans, became deeply interested in Saint-Simon and his disciples in the 1830's, but developed a maturer "philosophy" of history during the subsequent half-century.

Altogether aside from the argument of Doctor Shine there is plenty of thought-provoking quotation, from the rugged old titan with his torrential tumbling of choppy phrases and from the ingenious clap-trap of the strange French society, to arrest the reader's attention. Carlyle, early and late, could distinguish "epochs of advance as epochs of faith, and epochs of recession as epochs of denial or disbelief." He was stimulated to further minute analyses by the Saint-Simonians. But his fundamentally healthy instincts balked at their religious pretenses, and he soon learned to denounce them as he denounced, with the destroying wrath of a prophet, so much else in the age of industrialism.

There are dozens of quotable passages in the book. Carlyle was very fond of this gem, which he got from Goethe at the

time when the influence of Saint-Simon was supposedly strongest. He translates: "The special, sole, and deepest theme of the world's and man's history, whereto all other themes are subordinated, remains the conflict between unbelief and belief. All epochs wherein belief prevails, under what form it will, are splendid, heart-elevating, fruitful for contemporaries and posterity. All epochs, on the contrary, where unbelief, in what form soever, maintains its sorry victory, should they even for a moment glitter with sham splendour, vanish from the eyes of posterity, because no one chooses to burden himself with a study of the unfruitful."

R. CORRIGAN

The Legendary Character of Kaiser Maximilian, by Glenn Elwood Waas. New York. Columbia University Press. 1941. pp. 227. \$2.75

Any student of history will wonder how Kaiser Max came to be honored by the growth of a legend. This impractical, impecunious "last knight" of Europe was no Charlemagne, no Barbarossa, no Don John of Austria. But, it seems, he was a great hunter in the mountains, a rollicking companion among the burghers and an enthusiastic patron of the Humanists. He caught the popular imagination, and became something of a figure in literature. As such he makes a fairly good subject for a professor of languages. Doctor Waas, leaning heavily on folk-songs and ditties of various kinds, traces the evolving legend to 1600. He has been able to draw upon voluminous sources, documentary and secondary, in German.

R. CORRIGAN

Proceed, Sergeant Lamb, by Robert Graves. New York. Random House. 1941. pp. xi + 322. \$2.50

This historical novel is the sequel and conclusion of Robert Graves' *Sergeant Lamb's America*. Like the first volume it is based on Lamb's own *Journal* and *Memoir* which was published in Dublin in 1809 and 1811. The body of the story is built up "from contemporary records, British, American, French and German." The author has been careful not to invent or distort any facts of historical importance.

Sergeant Lamb was an English soldier who fought in the American Revolution. The present volume takes up the account of his life after the defeat of Burgoyne in the Battle of Saratoga. After escaping from a prison camp in Boston, Lamb joins the army of Cornwallis and fights in the Carolinas and Virginia. When Cornwallis surrenders at Yorktown, Lamb escapes once more. He travels to New York and finally reaches his native Ireland.

Like the first volume, *Proceed, Sergeant Lamb* is very much worth-while as historical literature, for it gives a graphic account of American life during the days of the War in a style which cannot be expected in the ordinary text-book. Moreover, the views advanced are those of an English soldier who points out enlightening details which an American patriot writing at the same period might overlook. Unfortunately, occasional shady illusions make the book undesirable for high school use.

CHARLES MEHOK

George B. McClellan, The Man Who Saved the Union, by H. J. Eckenrode and Bryan Conrad. University of North Carolina Press. 1941. pp. xi + 296. \$3.50

The authors of *James Longstreet, Lee's War Horse*, which won them a high place among writers of the military features of our Civil War, and who incidentally take the negative on the much-banded subject as to whether Longstreet disobeyed Lee's orders at the South's most critical moment at Gettysburg, now in the same field and with no less success rehabilitate "the most ill-judged man in American history," General McClellan.

In the volume criticized above we were introduced to a Washington City, rotten with selfish politicians and reeking with deadly jealousies; the picture is heightened here with an accurate portrayal of an army, after the disastrous defeat of Pope's battalions, and the heads of the government, except the President, crazed with ignorance and fear. The full and absorbing story of the demoralization of the Federal army and of the authorities in the capital city when Lee's victorious troops were beginning their first invasion of the North is told with minute detail. The mystery as to how and how far McClellan came into command is solved. It is true that the President empowered him merely to guard the city, but Halleck, then strangely enjoying the title of Commander-in-Chief, gave him unlimited

command. In both cases, in the confusion and haste of the hour, these orders were merely verbal. McClellan never had anything to show for them. It was with this act of faith in his superiors that McClellan won the victory at Antietam that permitted Lincoln to issue the Emancipation Proclamation and so deter Europe from siding with the Confederacy.

These authors limit their citations to the minimum. Critical minded readers will very properly find fault with the absence of any reference to an authority for the incredible statement (p. 157) that Halleck "gave preliminary orders for the evacuation of Washington" after Pope's debacle.

L. J. KENNY

When Painting Was in Glory, by Padraic Gregory. Milwaukee. Bruce. 1941. pp. xiv + 275. \$3.75

It is refreshing to the student and general reader to come across a book now and then which makes no pretense at research, but tries rather to present the beauties of the past in a simple, interesting, and unpedantic style. Such a book is Gregory's *When Painting Was in Glory*.

With the thesis in mind that Italy was not "sunk in the troughs of barbarism before the coming of Giotto and Duccio, and that the Church from the earliest times helped rather than hindered the development of painting," Mr. Gregory tells the story of the development of the pictorial art in the Church from Giotto to Titian. Obviously a book of such extensive compass will be able to give little more than a survey, a bird's-eye view, of the great artists and their work. It will appeal, therefore, more to the neophyte than to the accomplished art critic. But for him it is an ideal book, because it catches something of the color, and depth, and harmonious conceptions which mark the originals. It is well for us to realize that the Catholic Church, far from being the puritan that she has often been called, is rather the Mother of all that is beautiful and good in life. She has a monopoly on beauty because she is able to appreciate the beauty that this world offers, and is able to add to it the appreciation of great things yet to be when the beauties of this life shall have passed away. She has used music and song and the poetry of color to raise men's minds from the sordid things of earth to the sublime raptures of the world to come. Mr. Gregory has very proficiently shown that the history of painting is only another instance of how the things of God and the beauty of Christ and of His life have captured the hearts of men. It is this that differentiates his book from the majority of art manuals.

While it is true that art is to an extent a matter of personal taste, still this reviewer feels that the author is not quite correct in his estimation of Michelangelo and Da Vinci. Be that as it may, the reader will find the book worth reading.

R. LAKAS

The Story of American Catholicism, by Theodore Maynard. New York. Macmillan. 1941. pp. xv + 694. \$3.50

From Columbus to Cardinal O'Connell the Church in America has had an interesting and eventful life. Mr. Maynard has succeeded in capturing some of this interest in his readable account of Roman Catholicism in the United States. Across his pages march the great figures who contributed so generously to the making of Catholic America, churchmen like Carroll and Gibbons, laymen like Barry and Brownson. The author gives us a swift glance at the trials and troubles of the Church as well as its achievements. Torn from within by trusteeism and Cahenslyism, attacked from without by Nativism and the Know Nothing movement, the Church nonetheless continued its majestic march of progress.

Mr. Maynard tells us his story in a breezy popular manner always with an eye to reader interest. Sometimes however, he spends too much time and space on subjects which belong more to general United States history than to the history of the Church. Then too, the accuracy one expects in a historian is not always to be found in Mr. Maynard's pages. It may or may not be true that "Reconstruction came very near to bringing about the total extinction of the Catholic Church in the South" but one would like to see some proof for so sweeping a statement.

Mr. Maynard is something less than fair to the friars in his description of the Franciscan missionary effort in the Southwest.

The bogus bull published by the A.P.A. caused more than a smile if Washington Gladden and Elbert Hubbard are to be trusted.

The historian would disagree with Mr. Maynard's interpretation of the Turner thesis, an interpretation which more closely resembles an Atlantic seaboard caricature than the actual theory of the great frontier scholar.

It is difficult, indeed impossible, to understand how the author could have been present at the translation of Junipero Serra's remains since they lie where they always did—under the sanctuary of his beloved Mission San Carlos at Carmel.

Mr. Maynard is pleased to scoff at the doctorate degree as a "mere Label," but the discipline of a genuine post-graduate grind would have enabled him to arrange his notes and bibliography in a more scientific manner and would have added to the charm of the popularizer the accuracy of the trained scholar.

JOSEPH S. BRUSH

One Inch of Splendor, by Sister Mary Rosalia. New York. Field Afar Press. 1941. pp. 90. \$1.00

Sr. Mary Rosalia's *One Inch of Splendor* tells in a most simple and graceful fashion how the Church in China grew "another tiny inch into the pagan world that beat about its doors," and having told its tale, closes its cover on the eighty-sixth and final page to leave the reader well pleased with the quiet glimpse he has received of the Maryknoll sisters at work. There are journeys through small villages and the meaner streets of the large city, talk and tea with the Chinese women, scenes in the rice-fields and in the homes of converts, children to be brought into the fold—and always the invitation, "Come and hear the doctrine," so graciously given, so graciously received. There is an amazing optimism throughout Sister Mary's little book, and some readers might say that it gives a glamor to Chinese missionary work that is not really to be found there. Perhaps. But it has a beautiful explanation. Missionaries like the Maryknollers seldom see dirty natives as simply dirty, personal privation as simply personal. They are perhaps the most ambitious people in the world and they speak in terms of the divine and eternal and bargain for Life with life. It is one of the successful things about *One Inch of Splendor*, and large tribute to its author, that so much is conveyed of these higher realities of work for souls, romantic always in spite of ignorant natives, little cash, and bad smells.

GEORGE COURTRIGHT

Hennepin's Description of Louisiana, by Jean Delanglez, S.J. Chicago. Institute of Jesuit History. 1941. pp. viii + 164. \$2.70

For those scholars of French Colonial history who have long been puzzled as to the true extent of Fr. Hennepin's discovery and exploration in the Mississippi Valley and the veracity of his accounts as narrated in his various writings, Fr. Delanglez presents an enlightening critical essay, the fruit of arduous historical research, on the true authorship of Hennepin's greatest work, the *Description of Louisiana*.

The *Description*, an account of Fr. Hennepin's expedition of discovery and exploration in the Great Lakes Region, his ascent up the Mississippi from the mouth of the Illinois, his capture by the Sioux, and ultimate rescue by Duluth, is a travelogue interesting enough to warrant several editions in various languages. But who is the true author of the *Description*, and whether or not Fr. Hennepin plagiarized the *Relation des decouvertes* of Claude Bernou which bears such a striking resemblance to the *Description*, is the problem that Fr. Delanglez tries to solve in this volume. After stating and criticizing the three principal solutions as given by Margry, Shea, and DeVilliers, the author, by some very close but well-founded textual criticism of the style, geography, chronology, cartography, and Indian nomenclature as found in the *Relation* and *Description*, arrives at the conclusion that Fr. Hennepin's *Description* "is a plagiarism of the first two-thirds of the *Relation des decouvertes*."

This essay is indeed a tribute to the author's scholarly ability to criticize and evaluate manuscripts at his disposal. He has presented powerful arguments to support his thesis which is the last word in the Hennepin puzzle. While the volume is as interesting as such an essay can be expected to be, yet obviously its chief value is not for the casual reader, but rather for the specialist in French Colonial history.

F. STANTON